

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

JULY, 1840.

ART. I. — *Das Leben Jesu, Kritisch bearbeitet von Dr. DAVID FRIEDERICH STRAUSS.* Tübingen: 1837 2 voll. 8vo. *The Life of Jesus, critically treated, &c.* Second improved edition. (1st edition, 1835, 3d, 1839.)

THE celebrity of this work of Mr. Strauss abroad induces us to offer some account of it. Our analysis of its contents, — which is nearly all we propose to ourselves, — may, to most of those who are in the good habit of reading our pages, possess little interest or value. To such we say, pass it by; little will be lost by its neglect. We write not so much for the general reader as the theological, who, we think, will be gratified to see such a sketch as will enable him to form an intelligent judgment of a book, concerning which he has heard much, and which has made itself so famous among “the minute” philosophers and theologians of Germany. We set forth in our pages these new forms of objection to the Christian History, with the less hesitation as to any possible ill effect upon any mind, inasmuch as, in our opinion, no attack upon our religion, in either ancient or modern times, ever so carried along with it, in every step of its progress, its own abundant refutation. But, without more waste of words and time by prefatory remark, we address ourselves to the task before us.

It is not our design, in the small space we can command in a periodical, to attempt any defence of the doctrines assailed by the author of the “Life of Jesus;” since that would demand great erudition and skill, and would require large volumes. We shall reserve our brief remarks for the end of the paper.

It is our aim, merely to "define his position," as the politicians are wont to say. The work in question comprises, *first*, an Introduction, relating to the formation of "the Mythical standpoint," from which the Evangelical history is to be contemplated; *second*, the main work itself, which is divided into three books, relating respectively to the History of the Birth and Childhood of Jesus; his Public Life; his Sufferings, Death, and Resurrection; *third*, a conclusion of the whole book, on the doctrinal significance of the life of Jesus. The work forms two closely printed volumes, and comprises about sixteen hundred pages, thus making a work nearly as large as Mr. Hallam's History of Literature. It is not properly called a *Life of Jesus*; but a better, a more descriptive title would be, A Fundamental Criticism on the Four Gospels. In regard to learning, acuteness, and sagacious conjectures, the work resembles Niebuhr's History of Rome. Like that, it is not a history, but a criticism and collection of materials, out of which a conjectural history may be constructed. Mr. Strauss, however, is not so original as Niebuhr, (who yet had numerous predecessors, though they are rarely noticed,) but is much more orderly and methodical. The general manner of treating the subject, and arranging the chapters, sections, and parts of the argument, indicates consummate dialectical skill; while the style is clear, the expression direct, and the author's openness in referring to his sources of information, and stating his conclusions in all their simplicity, is candid and exemplary.*

The introduction to the work is valuable to every student of the Scriptures, who has sufficient sagacity to discern between the true and the false; to any other it is dangerous, very dangerous, from its "specious appearances." It is quite indispensable to a comprehension of the main work. We will give a brief abstract of some of its most important matters. If a form of religion rest on written documents, sooner or later, there ensues a difference between the old document and the modern discoveries and culture shown in works written to explain it. So long as the difference is not total, attempts will be made to reconcile the two. A great part of religious documents relate to sacred history, to events and instances of the Deity stepping into the circle of human affairs. Subsequently, doubts

* He professes very honestly, that he has no presuppositions. We shall touch upon this point.

arise as to the fact, and it is said "the divinity could not have done as it is alleged," or, "the deed could not be divine." Then attempts are made to show either that these deeds *were never done*, and, therefore, the documentary record is not entitled to historical credibility, or that they *were not done by God*, and, therefore, to explain away the real contents of the book. In each of these cases, the critic may go fearlessly to work; look facts clearly in the face; acknowledge the statements of the old record, with the inconsistency between them and the truths of science; or, he may go to work under constraint; may blind himself to this inconsistency, and seek merely to unfold the original meaning of the text. This took place in Greece, where religion did not rest on religious documents, but had yet a sort of connexion with the mythological stories of Homer and Hesiod, and with others, which circulated from mouth to mouth. The serious philosophers soon saw that these stories could not be true. Hence arose Plato's quarrel with Homer; hence Anaxagoras gave an *allegorical* explanation of Homer, and the stoics *naturalized* Hesiod's Theogony, supposing it related to the operations of Nature. Others, like Evhemerus, *humanized* and applied these stories to men, who by great deeds had won divine honors.

Now with the Hebrews, their stability, and their adherence to the supernatural stand-point would, on the one hand, prevent such views being taken of their religious records; and on the other, render this treatment the more necessary. Accordingly, after the exile, and still more after the time of the Maccabees, the Hebrew teachers found means to remove what was offensive; to fill up chasms, and introduce modern ideas into their religious books. This was first done at Alexandria. Philo, — following numerous predecessors, — maintained there was a *common* and a *deeper* sense in the Scriptures, and in some cases, the literal meaning was altogether set aside; especially when it comprised anything excessively Anthropomorphic, or unworthy of God. Thus he gave up the historical character, to save the credit of the narrative, but never followed the method of Evhemerus. The Christians applied the same treatment to the Old Testament, and Origen found a *literal*, *moral*, and *mystical* sense in all parts of the Scriptures, and sometimes applied the saying, "the letter killeth, but the spirit maketh alive" to the former. Some passages, he said, had no literal sense; in others, a *literal lie* lay at the bottom of a *mystical truth*. Many deeds, he says,

are mentioned in Scripture, which were never performed; fiction is woven up with fact to lead us to virtue. He rejected the literal sense of those passages which *humanize* the Deity. But Origen went farther, and applied these same principles to the New Testament, where he found much that was distasteful to his philosophical palate. Here also he finds fiction mingled with fact, and compares the Homeric stories of the Trojan war, in respect to their credibility, with the Christian narratives. In both Homer and the Gospels, he would consider what portions can be believed; what considered as figurative; what rejected as incredible, and the result of human frailty. He, therefore, does not demand a blind faith in the Gospels, but would have all Christians understand, that good sense and diligent examination are necessary, in this study, to ascertain the meaning of a particular passage. But this heretical father was too cautious to extend these remarks, and apply them extensively to particular passages. The Scriptures fell into the hands of men who acknowledged something divine in them; but denied that God had made therein particular manifestations of himself. This was done by Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian, who assented to much that is related of Moses and Jesus; while they found "lying legends" in other parts of the Bible.

Among the Greeks and Hebrews, whose religious literature was contemporary with the growth of the nation, the prevalence of allegorical interpretation of the sacred books proved that the oral forms of religion had died out, for the modern culture had outgrown the faith of the fathers of the nation. But in Christianity, the allegorical explanation adopted by Origen, and the peculiar opposition of Celsus taking place so near the birth of Christianity, prove that the world had not yet properly lived in the new form of religion. But, from the age after this time, when the rude Germanic nations, — too rude to find any difficulty in admitting the most objectionable parts of the Old and New Testament, — were conquering the Roman Empire, and becoming Christian at the same time, all proofs have disappeared, which would indicate the prevalence of a manner of interpreting the Scriptures, that arose from a radical discrepancy between the culture of mankind and the statements in these records. The Reformation made the first breach upon the solid walls of Ecclesiastical faith in the letter of the Bible. This was the first sign, that in Christianity, as formerly in Judaism

and Heathenism, there was a culture sufficiently powerful to react upon the prevalent form of religion.

So far as the Reformation was directed against the Romish Church, it soon accomplished its sublime mission. But in relation to the Scriptures, it took the direction of Deism. Toland and Bolingbroke called the Bible a collection of fabulous books. Others robbed the Scriptural heroes of all divine light. The law of Moses was considered a superstition; the apostles were called selfish; the character of Jesus was assailed; and his resurrection denied by a "moral philosopher." Here belong Chubb, Woolston, Morgan, and the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist. These scholars were ably opposed by a host of apologetical writers in England and Germany, who defended the supernatural character of the Bible. But in Germany there arose a different class of men, who designed to strip the Bible of its supernatural character, and direct divinity; but to leave its human character unharmed. They would not call the alleged miracles, *miracles*, nor consider them as *juggling*. Thus Eichhorn opposed the Deists, — who ascribed bad motives to the writers of Scripture, — but denied that there was anything supernatural in the stories of the Old Testament. He saw that he must deny this of the Bible, or admit it likewise of all ancient religious documents; for they all claimed it. We are not to be astonished, he says, at finding miracles in these writings, for they were produced in the infancy of the world; we must interpret them in the same spirit that composed them. Thus he can explain the history of Noah, Abraham, and Moses, by natural events.

Others treated the New Testament in the same manner. But the first Christian Evhemerus, was Dr. Paulus. He makes a distinction between the fact *related* and the *judgment* or *opinion respecting the fact*; for example, between the fact and the writer's opinion respecting its *cause* or *purpose*. The two, he supposes, are confounded in the New Testament, for its writers, like others in that age, took a supernatural view, and referred human actions to the direct agency of God. The office of an interpreter is to separate the *fact* from the *opinion* about the fact. Paulus, accordingly, believes the Gospels, but denies the supernatural causality of the events related. Jesus is not the Son of God, in the ecclesiastical sense, but a good man; he works no miracles, but does kind deeds, sometimes by surgical skill, and sometimes by good luck. Both Paulus and

Eichhorn, in order to maintain the truth of the narrative, must refer it to a date as early as possible; thus the former admits that Moses wrote the Pentateuch on the march through the wilderness, and the latter believes the genuineness of the Gospels. Both of these sacrifice the literal history for the sake of the great truths contained in the book.

Kant took a different position. He did not concern himself with the history, but only with the *idea* the history unfolded; this idea he considered not as theoretical and practical, but only the latter. He did not refer it to the divine mind, but to that of the writer, or his interpreter. Christian writers, he says, have so long interpreted these books, that they seem to harmonize with universal moral laws. But the Greeks and Romans did the same, and made Polytheism only a symbol of the various attributes of the One God, thus giving a mystical sense to the basest actions of the gods, and the wildest dreams of the poets. In the same way the Christian writings must be explained so as to make them harmonize with the universal laws of a pure moral Religion. This, even if it does violence to the text, must be preferred to the literal interpretation, which, in many instances, would afford no support to morality, and would sometimes counteract the moral sense. Thus he makes David's denunciation of his foes signify the desire to overcome obstacles. But it is not necessary these ideas should have been present to the mind of the writer of the books.

Here, Mr. Strauss continues, was, on the one hand, an *unhistorical*, and on the other, an *unphilosophical* method of treating the Bible. The progressive study of mythology shed light upon this subject. Eichhorn had made the reasonable demand that the Bible should be treated like other ancient books; but Paulus, attempting to treat others as he treated the Bible, could not naturalize the Greek legends and myths. Such scholars as Schelling and Gabler began to find myths in the Bible, and apply to them the maxim of Heyne, "a mythis omnis priscorum hominum cum historia, tum philosophia procedit." Bauer ventured to write a Hebrew mythology of the Old and New Testament. A myth was defined to be a narration proceeding from an age, when there was no written, authentic history, but when facts were preserved and related by oral tradition. It is a myth if it contains an account of things, — related in an historical way, — which *absolutely* could not be the objects of experience, such as events that took place in the supersensual world, or, which

could not *relatively* be objects of experience, such, for example, as, from the nature of the case, no man could witness. Or, finally, it is a myth if the narrative is elaborated into the wonderful, and is related in symbolic language.

Now the *naturalistic* method of interpreting the Bible could only be resorted to on the supposition of its historical accuracy, and that it was written contemporary with the events it relates. Accordingly, men who denied this carried out the mythical theory. The Pentateuch, says Vater, can be understood only on the supposition it was not written by eye-witnesses. De Wette declared still more strongly against the *naturalistic*, and in favor of the mythical hypothesis. To test the credibility of an account, he says, we must examine the writer's tendency. He may write history, and yet have a poetic tendency, and such is the case with the writers of the Old Testament. Fact and fiction are blended together therein, and we cannot separate them because we have no criterion or touch-stone, by which to examine them. The only source of our knowledge of events is the narrative relating the historical facts. We cannot go beyond this. In regard to the Old Testament, we must admit or reject these narratives; in the latter case, we relinquish all claim to any knowledge of the affairs related, for we have no other evidence respecting them. We have no right to impose a *natural* explanation on what is related as a *miracle*. It is entirely arbitrary to say the *fact* is genuine history, and the *drapery* alone is poetical; for example, we have no right to say Abram thought he would make a covenant with God, and that this fact lies at the bottom of the poetic narrative. Nor do we know what Abram thought. If we follow the narrative, we must take the fact as it is; if we reject it, we have no knowledge of the fact itself. It is not reasonable Abram should have such thoughts of his descendants possessing Palestine centuries afterwards, but quite natural, that they should write this poetic fiction to glorify their ancestor. Thus the *naturalistic* explanation destroys itself, and the mythical takes its place. Even Eichhorn confessed the former could not be applied to the New Testament, and Gabler, long ago, maintained, that there are in the New Testament, not only erroneous *judgments upon facts*, which an eye-witness might make, but also *false facts* and improbable results mentioned, which an eye-witness could not relate, but which were gradually formed by tradition, and are, therefore, to be considered myths. The

circumstance of writings and books being well known at the time of Christ, does not preclude the mythical view; for the facts must have been preserved orally long before they were written down. Besides, says Bauer, we have not in the New Testament a whole series of myths, but only single mythical stories. Anecdotes are told of a great man, which assume a more extraordinary character, the farther they spread. In a miracle-loving age, the obscure youth of Jesus would, after his name became illustrious, be embellished with miraculous stories, of celestial beings visiting his parents, predicting his birth and character. Where the records or authentic tradition failed, men gave loose to fancy, to historical conjectures, and reasonings in the style of the Jewish Christians, and thus created the philosophic myths of primitive Christian history. But men did not sit down with fancy aforethought, saying, "Go to, now, let us make myths;" but they were gradually formed; a little was added here and a little there. They would relate chiefly to the obscurest part of Christ's history. In obedience to this principle, Eichhorn, seeing that only a slender thread of apostolical tradition runs through the three first Gospels, rejects several stories from the life of Jesus, which offended his critical taste; for example, the gospel of the infancy, the temptation, some of his miracles, the resurrection of the saints at his death.

Now Mr. Strauss objects to his predecessors that for the most part, their idea of a myth is not just and definite; for in the case of an historical myth, they permit the interpreter to separate a natural, historical fact from the miraculous embellishments, which they refer to *tradition*; not, as the naturalist had done, to the *original author*. Thus the naturalist and the supernaturalist could admit historical but not philosophical myths, for then the entire historical basis seemed to fall away. Again; these views were not applied extensively — as far as they would go. Eichhorn admitted there was a myth on the threshold of the Old Testament. When the mythical hypothesis reached the New Testament, it was not permitted to go beyond the very entrance. It was admitted there could be no certain accounts of the early life of Jesus, and therefore that many false stories, suited to the taste of the times and the oracles of the Old Testament, have taken the place which there was no history to fill. But this does not in the slightest degree impair the credibility of the subsequent narrative. The evan-

gelists give an account of the three last years of his life; and here they were themselves eye-witnesses, or took the word of eye-witnesses. Then objections were brought against the end of the history, and the ascension was considered spurious or mythical. Thus critical doubts began to nibble at both ends of the narrative, while the middle remained untouched, or as some one has said, "Theologians entered the domain of Evangelical history through the gorgeous portals of the myth, and passed out at a similar gate; but in all that lay between these limits, they were content to take the crooked and toilsome paths of naturalistic explanation."

Mr. Strauss next inquires whether it is possible there should be myths in the New Testament, and, judging from outward arguments, he thinks it possible. Most Christians, he says, believe that is false which the Heathen relate of their gods, and the Mahommedans of their prophets, while the Scriptures relate only what is true respecting the acts of God, Christ, and the holy men. But this is a prejudice founded on the assumption that Christianity differs from heathen religions, in the fact that it alone is an historical, while they are mythical religions. But this is the result of a partial and confined view; for each of the other religions brings this charge against its rivals, and all derive their own origin from the direct agency of God. It is supposed that the Gospels were written by eye-witnesses, who were not deceived themselves, and were not deceivers, and, therefore, no room is left for the formation, or insertion of myths. But it is only a prejudice that the Gospels were written by eye-witnesses. The names of Matthew and John, for example, prefixed to these writings, prove nothing, for the Pentateuch bears the name of Moses, though it must have been written long after him; some of the Psalms bear the name of David, though they were written during the exile, and the book of Daniel ascribes itself to that prophet, though it was not written before the times of Antiochus Epiphanes. He finds little reason for believing the genuineness or the authenticity of the Gospels. Indeed, he regards them all as spurious productions of well-meaning men, who collected the traditions that were current in the part of the world, where they respectively lived. This is the weakest part of his book, important as the question is; yet weak as it is his whole argument rests upon it. The proofs of the spuriousness of these books are quite too feeble and uncertain for his purpose, and accordingly we are pleased to see from the pre-

face and many passages of the third edition, that his doubts upon the genuineness of John's Gospel have become doubtful, even to himself, after a farther study of it with the aid of the recent works of Neander and De Wette.* Our limits forbid us to enter upon the question of the genuineness of the Gospels.

Again, judging from the character of the books themselves, myths, according to Strauss, might be expected in the New Testament. It is sometimes said the mythical stories of the Bible differ from the Greek myths, in their superior moral character; but the alleged immorality of the Greek myths, arises from mistaking their sense, and some of the myths in the Old Testament are immoral, and if they could be formed, much easier could moral myths be made and accepted. It is sometimes said in opposition to the mythical hypothesis, that all these stories in the Bible appear natural if you admit the direct agency of God. But the same remark applies equally to the Greek and Indian myths. Still further, it is said, the Heathen myths represent God as a changing being, and thus contain the natural history of God, and the birth, infancy, youth, and manhood of Apollo, or Jupiter, for example; while those of the Bible represent Jehovah as eternally the same. But Jesus, the Son of God, the divine Logos incarnated, is the subject of history. Others say there can be no myths, because the time of Jesus was an historical and not a mythical age; but all parts of the world were not filled with the historical spirit, and fictions might easily grow up among the people, who had no design to deceive, and thus myths be formed. This is the more probable, for in ancient times, among the Hebrews, and in particular in the religious circles of that people, history and fiction, like poetry and prose, were never carefully separated, and the most respectable writers among the Jews and early Christians wrote works, and ascribed them to distinguished men of an earlier age.

His definition and criteria of a myth are as follows: a myth has two sides; first, it is not a history; and second, it is a fiction which has been produced by the state of mind of a certain community. I. It is not an historical statement; (1) if it contradict the well known laws of causality, (and here belong

* *Neander's Leben Jesu*; *De Wette's Exegetische Handbuch der N. T. Commentar in Johan.*

the direct actions and supernatural appearances of God and the angels, miracles, prophecies, and voices from Heaven, violations of the order of succession, and well known psychological laws ;) and (2) when the writers or witnesses contradict each other, in respect to *time*, (for example, of the purification of the temple,) *place*, (the residence of Joseph and Mary,) *number*, (the Gadarenes and angels at the grave,) or in respect to *names* and other circumstances. II. A narrative is shown to be legendary or fictitious, (1) if it is poetical in *form*, and the discourses of the characters are longer and more inspired than we need expect, (for example, the discourses of Jesus,) and (2) if the *substance* of the narrative agrees remarkably with the preconceived opinions of the community where it originated, it is more or less probable the narrative grew out of the opinion. He adds several qualifications and modifications of these tests.

Having thus drawn lines of circumvallation and contravallation about the Gospels, Mr. Strauss thus opens the attack upon the outworks. The narrative relating to John the Baptist, he says, is not authentic ; it is not probable the angelic state is constituted as it is here supposed. This idea was borrowed by the later Jews from the Zend religion, and the name of the angel Gabriel, and his office to stand before God, are Babylonian. The angel's discourse and conduct are objectionable ; he commands that the child shall be trained up as a Nazarite, and smites Zacharias with dumbness, which is not consistent with "theocratic decorum." Admitting the existence of angels, they could not reveal themselves to men, since they belong to different spheres. The naturalists and the supernaturalists fail to render this story credible, and we are, therefore, forced to doubt its literal accuracy. Some writers suppose there are historical facts at the bottom of this tale, for example, the sterility of Elizabeth, the sudden dumbness of Zacharias, and his subsequent restoration. But there is no better reason for admitting these facts, than for admitting the whole story. It must be regarded as a myth, and is evidently wrought out in imitation of others in the Old Testament. It resembles the story of Sarah, in the age of the parties ; Elizabeth is a daughter of Aaron, whose wife bore this same name. The appearance of the angel, who foretels the birth of John, his character, and destiny, is evidently an imitation of the prophecy respecting Samson, and there is a very strong resemblance between the language of Luke in this part of the story, and that of the Sep-

tuagint in the account of Samson's birth. The conclusion of the story (l. 80,) resembles the end of the story of Ishmael, (Gen. xxi. 20.) The name John, [God's Gift] which was not a family name, renders the narrative still more suspicious. Thus the whole is a myth. We think Mr. Strauss, for the sake of consistency, ought to deny that John the Baptist was an historical person, and doubtless he would have done so, were it not for an unfortunate passage in Josephus, which mentions that prophet. A rigorous application of his tests would deprive John of historical existence. But Josephus saves him.

He next examines the *genealogies of Jesus*.

Matthew enumerates three series, each of fourteen generations, or forty-two in the whole, between Abraham and Jesus, and gives the names of the individuals; but the number actually given does not agree with his enumeration, and no hypothesis relieves us of the difficulty. If we compare this list with the Old Testament, it is still more objectionable, for it omits several well known names, and contains some mistakes. Luke's genealogy differs still more widely from the Old Testament; from Nathan, the son of David, downward, he mentions only *two* persons, who occur in the Old Testament, namely, Salathiel and Zorobabel, and even here it contradicts the narratives in 1 Chronicles, iii. 17, 19, 20. If we compare these two genealogies together, there is a striking difference between them. Luke reckons *forty-one* generations from David to Joseph, the father of Jesus, where Matthew makes but *twenty-six*, and, with the two exceptions above named, the names are all different in the two narrations. According to Luke, the father of Joseph is *Heli*, a descendant of *Nathan*, son of David; according to Matthew, Joseph's father is *Jacob*, a descendant of *Solomon*. Various attempts have been made to reconcile these conflicting genealogies, but they all rest on arbitrary suppositions. It is sometimes said one contains the genealogy of Joseph, the other of Mary; but this also is an arbitrary supposition, at variance with the text, and is not supported by any passage in the Bible. We must, then, conclude these genealogies are arbitrary compositions, which do not prove the Davidic descent of Jesus, who was called *son of David*, because he was considered as the Messiah. It is easily conceivable that a Galilean, whose descent was unknown, after he had acquired the title of Messiah, should be represented by tradition as a son of David. On the strength of these traditions gene-

alogies were composed, which, for want of authentic documents, were as various and conflicting as these two of Luke and Matthew.

He then treats of the *miraculous birth of Jesus*.

Here he makes use of two apocryphal Gospels, quoted by several of the early fathers. He shows the striking difference between the accounts of Matthew and Luke, concerning the birth of Jesus. But since the same view has been taken amongst us by Mr. Norton, and this remarkable discrepancy has been pointed out by him in a work well known and justly valued by the readers of this journal, it is unnecessary to enter further into the subject. Mr. Norton rejects Matthew's account as spurious and unauthentic; while Mr. Strauss, with more perfect logical consistency, rejects likewise Luke's narrative, on the ground that Gabriel talks like a Jew; that the supernatural birth is impossible; that if an human birth implies the sinfulness of the child, then a celestial mother is needed also, that the child may be free from sin. Again, there are exegetical difficulties, for Mark and John omit this part of the history, and the latter had the best possible means of information, and it is always supposed in the New Testament that Jesus was Joseph's son. Beside, if Jesus were the Son of God, how could he be the son of David, and why are the two genealogies given to prove that descent, one of which is confessed, on all hands, to be the genealogy of Joseph, who, by the supernatural hypothesis, was no wise related to Jesus? In this case the genealogies would prove nothing. It is not possible, they proceeded from the same hand as the story of the supernatural birth, and Mr. Strauss conjectures they are the work of the Ebionites, who denied that article of faith. The attempts of the rationalists and the supernaturalists are alike insufficient, he thinks, to explain away the difficulties of this narrative; but if we regard it as a myth, the difficulty vanishes, and its origin is easily explained. The story itself, in Matthew, refers to Isaiah, (vii. 14,) and that prophecy seems to have been the groundwork of this myth. In the old world, it was erroneously supposed, or pretended, that great men were the descendants of the gods; for example, Hercules, the Dioscuri, Romulus, Pythagoras, and Plato, of whose remarkable birth Jerome speaks. This mythus, therefore, grew naturally out of the common Jewish notions at the time, and was at last written down.

He next examines *the account of the census, and the early life of Jesus*.

Luke informs us that Augustus Cæsar issued a decree "that all the world should be taxed," or numbered; but no other writer mentions a *general census* in the time of Augustus, though a census was made in some provinces. If we limit the term "all the world" to Judea, still it is improbable such a census was made at that time, for the Romans did not make a census of conquered countries until they were reduced to the form of a province, and Judea did not become a Roman province until after the disgrace and banishment of Archelaus, which event took place after he had reigned ten years as an allied sovereign. Luke says this census was made when Quirinus was governor of Syria. Now it was not Quirinus, but Sentius Saturninus, and after him, Quint. Varus, who were proconsuls of Syria in the latter years of Herod I., and it was some years after his death that Quirinus became proconsul of Syria, and actually made a census, as Josephus relates. Luke also refers to this latter census, (Acts v. 37,) and speaks of Judas the Galilean, who rebelled on this occasion, as Josephus inform us. Now it cannot be true, that Jesus was born at so late a period as the time of this census, under Quirinus, for, — not to mention the chronological difficulties this hypothesis would create in the latter years of Jesus, — this census could not have extended to Galilee, the residence of Joseph and Mary, for that state was governed by Herod Antipas, in the capacity of allied Prince, and accordingly was not a province; therefore, Joseph would not be summoned to Judea when the census of that province was taken. Still further, it is not probable the Romans would assemble the citizens together by families in the birth-place of the founder of the family, to enrol them.

One evangelist makes Joseph live at Bethlehem, the other at Nazareth. Now the design of the author, in placing the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem, is obvious. He wished the prophecy in Micah (v. 2,) to be fulfilled in Jesus, for the Jews applied it to the Messiah. The author, setting out from the opinion that Joseph and Mary dwelt at Nazareth, sought for some natural errand to bring them to Bethlehem. He found a suitable occasion in the well known census of Quirinus; but not understanding accurately the circumstances of the time and place, he has brought hopeless confusion into the narrative, if it is taken for genuine history. We have, therefore, no reason, concludes Mr. Strauss, for believing Jesus was born at Bethlehem, for the story is a myth.

Other circumstances in this narrative present difficulties. What purpose, asks Mr. Strauss, is served by the angels, who appear at the birth of Jesus? * It could not be to publish the fact; nor to reward the believing shepherds, who, like Simeon, were waiting for the consolation, nor yet to glorify the unconscious infant. They seem sent to the shepherds, because they were supposed to be more simple and religious than the artificial Pharisees. Similar objections may be made to the story of the magi, who, it is presupposed, knew beforehand, as astrologers, that a king of the Jews was to be born. A miraculous star guides them; but a *star* does not change its position relatively to earthly places, and a *meteor* does not appear so long as this guide seems to have done. The conduct of Herod is not consistent with his shrewdness, for he sends no officer with the magi to seize the new-born Messiah. The story of the massacre of the innocents at Bethlehem is not mentioned by any ancient author, except Macrobius, a writer of the fourth century, and he confounds it with Herod's murder of his son Antipater. The Rabbins, who never spare this tyrant, do not mention it. True it was but a drop in Herod's sea of guilt, but it is so peculiarly horrible, and revolting, that they would not pass over it. In this short passage there are four miraculous dreams and a miraculous star, not to mention the misinterpretation of the Old Testament. (Matt. ii. 23.)

But the whole story is mythical, and is derived from ideas and opinions commonly held at the time. The ancients believed a heavenly body sometimes appeared on great occasions, for example, a comet, at the birth of Mithridates, and at the

* Mr. Norton, (p. lxi. of the additional notes to his "Genuineness of the Gospels,") thus disposes of these difficulties in Luke's narrative; "With its real miracles, the fictions of oral tradition had probably become blended; and the individual by whom it was committed to writing probably added what he regarded as poetical embellishments. It is not necessary to believe, for example, that Mary and Zachariah actually expressed themselves in the mythical language of the hymns ascribed to them; or to receive as literal history the whole of the account respecting the birth of John the Baptist, or of the different appearances of an angel, announcing himself as Gabriel. With our present means of judging, however, we cannot draw a precise line between the truth, and what has been added to the truth. But in regard to the main event, the miraculous conception of Jesus, it seems to me not difficult to discern in it purposes worthy of God." But see, on the other hand, the opposite opinion of Mr. Stuart, American Biblical Repository for October, 1838.

death of Julius Cæsar. The Rabbins assert a star appeared at the birth of Abraham. It was their opinion that a star would appear in the East, and remain visible for a long time, at the period of the Messiah's birth. Balaam also had predicted that a star should come out of Jacob. In ancient times, it was supposed stars guided men, for example, Æneas, Thrasybulus, and Timoleon; and the Jews fancied that a star conducted Abraham to Mount Moriah. Isaiah had foretold, that in the days of the Messiah men should come from distant lands to worship, bringing gold and incense. Again, many great characters of antiquity had escaped from imminent peril, for example, Cyrus, Romulus, Augustus, and Moses, in early life. Abraham, Jacob, and Moses had saved their lives at a later age, by flight. All these ideas and reminiscences, therefore, appear in the two narratives, which are different variations of the same theme, though they have had no direct influence, one upon the other.

Matthew passes in silence over the entire period, from the return from Egypt to the baptism of Jesus, and Luke mentions but a single circumstance of his early life, namely, his conversation, when twelve years old, with the Doctors. But this event cannot be historical; for it is not probable he would, at that age, be admitted to a seat in the council of the rabbis. His reply to his parents would not have been misunderstood, if the previous events had taken place as they are related. The whole story, Mr. Strauss contends, is a myth, conceived to suit the opinion that great men are remarkable in their childhood. Thus, in the Old Testament, Samuel is consecrated in his childhood; the later traditions, which Philo and Josephus follow, ascribe wonderful things to Moses at an early age, though the Bible knows nothing of them. Tradition says that Samuel prophesied from his *twelfth* year, and that Solomon and Daniel uttered wise oracles at the *same age*; 1 Kings, iii. 23, seq.; Susannah, vs. 45, seq.

The next chapter treats of the *public ministry* of Jesus. We pass over the chronological difficulties relating to the ministry of John the Baptist, which have been carefully collected by Mr. Strauss, and come to his connexion with Jesus. The baptism of John seems based chiefly on some figurative expressions of the Old Testament, according to which God would wash away the sins of his unregenerate people, before the Messiah came. These passages could easily be combined so as to make

it appear that baptism, as the symbol of repentance, must precede the Messiah's coming.

Luke informs us that John was a kinsman of Jesus, and that their respective mothers were acquainted with the sublime destiny of their children, even before the latter were born. Matthew knows nothing of this, but ascribes to John, at the baptism of Jesus, expressions, which imply a previous acquaintance with him; for otherwise he would not refuse to baptize Jesus, on the ground of his own unworthiness to baptize a being so far above him. These two gospels, then, agree in presupposing the acquaintance of John and Jesus. But the fourth Gospel makes John distinctly deny the fact. (i. 31-33.) The appearance of the sign first assures him of the character of Jesus.

All the Gospels agree that John calls himself a forerunner of the Messiah, and that he was convinced Jesus was that Messiah. But Matthew and Luke relate, that after his imprisonment, John sent two of his disciples to James, to ascertain the fact. Now if he was convinced by the sign at the baptism, he ought still more to have been convinced by the miracles of Jesus, that he was the Messiah. He could not have sent his disciples to Jesus, in order to strengthen *their* faith, for he did not know Jesus would work wonders in their presence, nor would he compromise his own assertion, that Jesus was the Messiah; and yet if he himself believed it, he would not urge his superior to declare himself immediately, but would leave him to decide for himself.

The fourth Gospel contains the most definite expressions respecting the Messiahship of Jesus, and puts them in John's mouth. But did the Baptist consider him an expiatory sufferer? Did he ascribe to him an antemundane, celestial existence, as the Evangelist has done? We find no proofs of it, except in this fourth Gospel. Now it is not probable the Baptist had this conception of the office and nature of Jesus; nor is it probable, that he made the reply to his disciples, which this evangelist ascribes to him, (iii. 27-36,) where he confesses that he, (John,) is From beneath, but Jesus From above, the One Sent by God, the Son of God, Speaking God's words, and Born of God. He must increase, and I decrease. It is probable that the evangelist put these words into John's mouth, but not that the Baptist ever uttered them, for if he had so deep an insight into the nature of the kingdom of God, and the character and office of the Messiah, and believed Jesus to be that

Messiah, the latter would never have said that men so rude in their conceptions, as the humblest of his disciples, were superior to John the Baptist; for Peter, the very greatest of these disciples, never attained the lofty conception that Jesus was the Son of God, the "Lamb, who taketh away the sin of the world." Besides, the character of John renders it incredible he would place himself at the feet of Jesus, the very opposite of himself in all respects. This man of the desert, rough and austere, could not become a pattern of the profoundest Christian resignation. A man on a humbler stand-point, (like that of John,) cannot comprehend the man on a superior stand-point, (like that of Jesus.) If this, which is related of John were true, "It would be the only instance on record of a man belonging to the history of the whole world, voluntarily, and in such good humor, giving up the reins of the affairs he had so long directed to a man who succeeded him, only to cast him into the shade, and render his mission unnecessary." The fourth Gospel, then, would make the Baptist unlike the Baptist of the Synoptics and Josephus. The statement, in John i. 29 - 35, is derived in part from fancy, and partly from an embellishment of the narrative in the Synoptics.

Now the origin of the narratives relating to the Baptist, Mr. Strauss contends, is very easily explained. Paul related the historical fact, that John spoke in the name of one to come, and added, Jesus was that one. Afterwards, men spoke as if John had a *personal* acquaintance with Jesus. This view, though not supported by facts, pleased the early Christians, who were glad to have the Baptist's authority on their side. But there seems no reason for believing there ever was such a recognition of Jesus on the part of John; nor is it probable that, while in prison on the charge of sedition, (as Josephus says,) he would be permitted to hold free intercourse with his disciples. The historical facts are, perhaps, the following: Jesus was baptized by John; perhaps continued for some time one of his followers; was entrusted by John with the idea of the approaching Messiah. After John was cast into prison, he continued to preach the doctrines of his master in a modified form, and afterwards, when he rose far above John, never ceased to feel and express a deep reverence for him. Now we can trace the gradual formation of these stories. John spoke indefinitely of the coming Messiah; tradition added, that he proclaimed *Jesus* as that Messiah. It was thought the rumor of the works of Jesus might

have led him to this conclusion, and, therefore, Matthew's story of the mission of two disciples from the prison was formed. But since Jesus had been a disciple of John, it was necessary the relation should be changed, and this purpose is served by Luke's stories of events before his birth, which prove Jesus is the superior. But these accounts were not sufficiently definite, and, therefore, the fourth Gospel leaves no doubt in John's mind that Jesus was the Messiah, but makes him give the strongest assurance of this, the first time he sees him, and ascribes to him the most distinct expressions touching his eternal nature, divinity, and character, as a suffering and atoning Messiah. Now the accounts of John's imprisonment and execution are easily reconciled with one another and with Josephus; and hence we see that his life, as portrayed in the Gospels, is surrounded by mythical shadows only on the side turned towards Jesus, while on the other, the historical features are clearly seen.

The miraculous events at the baptism of Jesus, Mr. Strauss maintains, also present difficulties. The Synoptics mention both the dove and the voice; the fourth Gospel says nothing of the voice, and does not say, — though, perhaps, it implies, — that the spirit descended on him at the baptism. The lost gospels of Justyn and the Ebionites, connected with this a celestial light, or fire burning in the Jordan. According to the fourth Gospel, John was the only witness of the spirit descending upon Jesus like a dove; but Luke would make it appear there were many spectators. Taking all the accounts, there must have been some objective phenomena visible and audible. But here the cultivated man finds difficulties and objections. Must the heavens open for the divine spirit to pass through? Is it consistent with just notions of the infinite spirit, to suppose it must move like a finite being from place to place, and can incorporate itself in the form of a dove? Does God speak with a human voice? The various theories, naturalistic and supernaturalistic, fail of removing these difficulties. It cannot have been an aggregation of natural events, nor a subjective vision of John, Jesus, or the multitude.

In some of the old gospels now lost, the words, "*Thou art my beloved son,*" &c. were followed by these, "*This day have I begotten thee.*" Clement of Alexandria and Augustine seem to have found them in their copies, and some manuscripts of Luke still contain the words. These words, (from Psalm ii. 7,) were supposed by Jewish and Christian interpreters, to re-

late to the Messiah, in their original application. Now to make them more effective, and their application to Jesus, as the Messiah, the more certain, this story naturally grew up, that a celestial voice applied them to Jesus. It was perfectly in the spirit of Judaism, and primitive Christianity, to believe such voices were addressed to men. Some of the Rabbis, it is said, received them not rarely. Still further, Joel and Isaiah had predicted the outpouring of the divine spirit in the days of the Messiah. This spirit he also was to receive. If Jesus were the Messiah, he must receive this spirit ; and the occasion of his baptism afforded a very favorable opportunity. But how should it be known that it came upon him ? It must descend in a visible form. The dove is a sacred bird in Syria, and, perhaps, in Judea. The Jews supposed the spirit of God " moved on the face of the deep " in this form. The dove, therefore, was a proper symbol and representative of the divine spirit. These features were all successively united in a mythus, which gradually grew up. There is, then, no reason for doubting that Jesus was baptized by John ; but the other circumstances are mythical, and have been added at a later date. Here Mr. Strauss is false to his principles, and separates the fact from the drapery, which surrounds the fact.

But the whole story of the descent of the spirit on Jesus, continues the author, seems at variance with the previous account of his conception by that spirit. If the divine spirit was the proper parent of Jesus, why should that spirit descend and abide upon him ? It could not thereby produce a more intimate union between them. We must suppose this story originated in a community which did not believe the supernatural conception of Jesus ; and in fact we find that Christians, who did not admit the supernatural conception, believed the divine spirit was first imparted to Jesus at his baptism, and the Orthodox fathers persecuted the old Ebionites for nothing more rigorously, than for maintaining that the holy spirit, or the celestial spirit, *first* united himself with the man Jesus at his baptism. According to Justyn, it was the Jewish notion, that a higher power would be first imparted to the Messiah, when he was anointed by Elias. This seems to have been the primitive belief ; but afterwards, when reverence for Jesus rose higher, a myth grew up to prove that his Messiahship, and divine son-ship, did not commence with his baptism, but with his conception ; and then the words, "*this day have I begotten thee,*" were left out, because they could not be reconciled with the Orthodox view.

The story of the temptation also, Mr. Strauss contends, has its difficulties. John does not mention it, but makes Jesus appear in Galilee three days after his baptism, while the Synoptics say, he went immediately after this event into the wilderness, and fasted forty days. The Synoptics also differ slightly among themselves. There are other difficulties. Why did the Divine Spirit subject Jesus to this temptation by a visible Satan? Not to ascertain what manner of spirit he was of; nor to try him, for his subsequent trials were sufficient. Again, a man could not abstain from food for forty days. Therefore some say, this is only a round number, and the fasting was not total abstinence from food; but this theory does not agree with the text. Still farther, wherein consisted the utility of this fast? But the personal devil is the chief stone of stumbling. His visible appearance has its difficulties. How could the devil hope to seduce Jesus, knowing his superior nature? and if ignorant of this, he would not have taken the pains to appear visibly before him. The second temptation could offer no attractions to Jesus, and therefore is not consistent with the alleged character of the devil. How could he transfer Jesus from place to place? Their appearance on the pinnacle of the temple would create a sensation. Where is the mountain, whence he could show Jesus all the kingdoms of the world? To say the *world* is Palestine, with its four provinces, is no less absurd than to maintain with Fritzsche, that the devil showed Christ all the countries on the map of the world. Attempts have been made to explain this story as an account of what passed in the mind of Jesus, either in an extatic vision, occasioned directly by God, or the devil, or by his own natural thoughts arising in a dreamy state, when he spontaneously transformed the thoughts into persons speaking and acting. But why should the Deity, or how could the Devil effect this? To suppose it was the result of his own natural thoughts, implies that Jewish notions of the Messiah had a strong influence on him even after his baptism. The merely natural view is absurd. Some call it a parable, designed to show, that no miracle is to be wrought for the man's self; hope of extraordinary divine aid should not lead to rash undertakings; and an alliance with the wicked must never be made even to obtain the greatest good. But if this is so, why does it not wear the form of a parable? It is easy to explain it as a myth. The Messiah was regarded as the concentration of all that is good, and the devil of all evil. He opposes Jesus, but can at

farthest only produce momentary bad thoughts, not bad resolutions. Many passages in Jewish writings indicate a common belief that the Messiah would be tempted by the devil, as they say Abraham had been before. If Jesus was the Messiah, he must encounter this temptation, which, like that of Hercules, was very suitably placed just at his entrance upon active life. The scene of the temptation is well chosen, for the wilderness was not only the dwelling-place of Azazel, (Levit. xvi. 9, 10,) Asmodeus, (Tobit, viii. 3,) and the expelled demons; but it was the place where the whole nation, the *collective son of God*, was tempted forty years; and there is a strong analogy between their temptations and that of Jesus. The story was gradually formed out of these Jewish notions, without the slightest intention to deceive.

There is a striking discrepancy, Mr. Strauss affirms, between the Synoptics and John in respect to many parts of Christ's ministry. The former represent him to have spent the greater part of his life in Galilee; while the latter places him in Jerusalem and Judea. From them we should suppose he spent all his life in Galilee and the Peræa, before his last visit to Jerusalem, while John relates four previous journeys to that place, and a visit to Bethany. If John is in the right, the Synoptics were ignorant of an essential part of Christ's ministry; but if the latter are in the right, then he has invented a great part of the history, or at least transferred it to a wrong place.

We pass over the chronological and many other difficulties. The Synoptics and John disagree in respect to the assumption of the office and title of Messiah. According to John, Jesus confessed early, that he was the Messiah, and the disciples remained faithful to the conviction, that he spoke the truth, (i. 42, 46, 50.) To follow the Synoptics, he did not take this title until a late period of his life; he supposes a special revelation had announced the fact to Peter, (Matthew xvi. 17,) and charges the apostles to tell no man of it. Two views may be taken of the case. Jesus was a follower of John the Baptist, and after his teacher was cast into prison he preached repentance, and the approach of the Messiah, and concluded he was himself that Messiah. This view would account for the fact, that he was disturbed when called by this name, and therefore forbid his disciples to speak of him in that relation. But since these prohibitions are doubtful, and if real, they may be accounted for, without supposing Jesus was not thoroughly convinced of his Messiah-

ship, for it cannot be supposed that he who made such a revolution in the world, as no other man has ever done, ever faltered in the midst of his course, in his conviction that he was the Messiah. Since, then, he must have had a clear consciousness of his calling, we conclude that he was convinced of his Messiahship, from the time of his first appearance in that relation, but was somewhat reserved in expressions of this conviction, because he preferred the disciples should gradually learn the truth from the silent testimony of his life and works.

The Synoptics, says Mr. Strauss, never speak of the preëxistence of Jesus, while John often mentions it. Now the preëxistence of the Messiah was an article of faith with the Jews, soon after Christ, and it is probable they believed it before his time. But it must remain doubtful whether Jesus entertained this idea, or whether John has ascribed it to him without any authority.

Mr. Strauss considers the story of the woman of Samaria an unhistorical myth. The whole scene has a legendary and poetic coloring. The position at the well is the "idyllic locality of the old Hebrew stories." The scene is the same as in the stories of Eliezer, Jacob, and Moses, all of whom meet women at a well. In this case, the woman, weak and good-humored, who had had five husbands, but then had none, is a symbol of the Samaritan people, who had forsaken Jehovah, &c. &c. This story, then, is only a poetic account of the ministry of Jesus among the Samaritans, which itself is not a matter of history, but is only a "legendary prelude of the extension of Christianity" among that people after Christ's death.

But we must press on with more rapid wheels. The calling of the apostles presents numerous difficulties, for there are great discrepancies between the accounts of John and the Synoptics. It is not probable Jesus understood the character of men at first glance of their persons, (John i. 46, seq.) (though the Jews expected the Messiah, *odorando judicare*, as Schottgen has it;) nor is it probable the disciples would immediately forsake all and follow him. These stories are mythical, and evident imitations of the legendary history of Elijah, and his followers. As Elisha left his oxen and ran after Elijah, (1 Kings, xix. 19, seq.) so the disciples presently left their nets and followed Jesus. Elisha received permission to go and take leave of his parents, but now the call of the Messiah is so urgent, that he rejects a young man who made the same request, (Luke ix. 60, seq.)

and will not suffer a convert even to go and bury his father. The historical fact may be that some of his disciples were fishermen, but they must have come gradually into their connexion with Jesus.

John does not mention that the twelve disciples were sent on a mission ; and the Synoptics relate nothing of their baptizing converts during their teacher's life. It is probable Jesus had a body of *twelve* disciples ; but Luke's statement, that he had also a larger circle of *seventy* disciples, is not confirmed by any other evangelist, by the book of Acts, nor by any Epistle. It is evidently formed in imitation of the story of *seventy* elders in the Pentateuch. The accounts of Peter's fishing expeditions, and Christ's miraculous draught of fishes, like that of Pythagoras, are self-contradictory, and all mythical.

There is a great difference between Christ's discourses in John, and the Synoptics ; they have but few expressions in common, even their internal character is entirely different. The latter differ among themselves in this respect ; Matthew gives large masses of discourse, Luke short discourses on different occasions, and Mark offers but a meagre report of his sayings. Matthew's report of the sermon on the mount differs very widely from that of Luke ; many of the expressions in Matthew's report are obviously misplaced ; for example, Jesus could not, at the commencement of his ministry, have declared that he came to fulfil the law and the prophets, for he had not declared himself the Messiah, of whom alone this was expected. By comparing all the accounts together, we see, says Mr. Strauss, that "the granular discourses of Jesus have not been dissolved and lost in the stream of oral tradition, but they have, not rarely, been loosened from their natural connexion, washed away from their original position, and like boulders rolled to places where they do not properly belong. By this comparison, we find that Matthew has not always restored the fragments to their original connexion ; but yet, like a skilful collector, for the most part, has made an intelligible arrangement, joining like with like ; while in the two other Gospels, some small pieces are suffered to lie, where chance has thrown them, in the chasms between large masses of discourse, and Luke has sometimes given himself the pains to arrange them artificially, but has not been able to restore the natural connexion." I. p. 63.

We pass over the alleged instructions of the twelve, and the parables, where the only difficulty lies in the discrepancy of the

several narratives. Mr. Strauss thinks the controversial discourses of Jesus are genuine, because they correspond so closely to the spirit and tone of rabbinical explanations of Scripture, at that time. The discourses which John ascribes to Jesus present greater difficulties. Let us take the conversation with Nicodemus. He is not mentioned by the other evangelists. It is difficult to believe that, if John's account is true, so distinguished a follower of Jesus as Nicodemus, would be omitted by Matthew, an immediate disciple of Christ, — to follow the tradition. Still more difficult is it to believe, he would be forgotten by the oral tradition, which was the source of the Synoptical Gospels, which remember Joseph of Arimathea, and the two pious Marys. This difficulty is so great, that we are tempted to ask if it is not more natural that John has followed a traditional legend, and that there never was such a man as Nicodemus? The Synoptics relate that the mysteries of the Messiah were understood by babes and sucklings, but were concealed from the wise and prudent. They mention Joseph of Arimathea as the only disciple from "the better sort" of people. John says the Pharisees attempted to "put Jesus down," by saying, none of the rulers or Pharisees, but only the ignorant and infamous populace believed on him. Celsus subsequently made this objection, which was, no doubt, often brought in the early times of Christianity. So long as only the poor and unlearned embraced this religion, they comforted themselves by Christ's blessings pronounced upon the poor and simple; but when men of "character and standing" became Christians, they wished to find others of their own class among the direct disciples of Jesus. Not finding any such, they could say, "they were his secret followers, who came to him by night, for fear of the Jews," (John xii. 42, seq., xix. 39.) Joseph of Arimathea was one of this class; but more than one such was needed. Therefore this story was formed to remove the difficulty. The Greek name of Nicodemus clearly indicates his connexion with "the higher classes" of society in Judea. He is mentioned only in John's Gospel, because this is the most modern, and was composed in a community where the above objection was most keenly felt.

But this is only a conjecture; and even if it is well grounded, it should excite no prejudice against the conversation itself. This may, in all its essential features, be a genuine discourse Jesus held with one of the common people. It is incredible that a Jewish teacher should not have understood the new birth; but

it was for the interest of the story to show how far Jesus rose above other Jewish teachers. They were but fools compared to the Great Teacher. Nicodemus applies to earthly things what Jesus asserts of heavenly things. It is not probable, that Jesus really spoke in the manner John relates, for this manner differs from that of the Synoptics. There he dwells on particular points, "with genuine pedagogical assiduity," until he has completely explained them, and then passes on, step by step, to other instructions, as a true teacher must do. But in the fourth Gospel, he speaks in a desultory and exaggerated manner, which can be explained only by supposing it was the narrator's design to set the Teacher's wisdom and the pupil's ignorance in the most striking contrast.

John makes Jesus speak very differently from the Synoptics; for example, in Matthew, Jesus defends his violation of the Sabbath by three practical arguments; the example of David eating the holy bread; of the priests sacrificing on the Sabbath; and of a man saving the life of a beast on that day. But in John he uses the metaphysical argument, drawn from the uninterrupted activity of God; "My father worketh hitherto." Besides, there is the closest analogy between the language of Jesus in the fourth Gospel and that of John's first Epistle, and those passages of the Gospel, in which either this evangelist himself, or John the Baptist speaks; and since this language differs from that of the other Gospels, we must conclude, the words belong to John, and not Jesus. Perhaps he invents suitable occasions, (as Plato has done,) and writes down his own reflections in the form of his master's discourses. His frequent repetition of the same thought, or form of expression, is quite striking. We must conclude that this evangelist treated the authentic tradition in the freest manner, and in the tone and spirit of the Alexandrians, or Hellenists.*

We pass over a long statement of discrepancies between the several Gospels, and other matters, of greater or less importance, which Mr. Strauss has treated with his usual freedom, learning, and dialectical clearness of vision. His explanation of the several stories of the sinful women, who anointed the feet of Jesus, is

* In the third edition, p. 741, he adds; "I cannot maintain that John's discourses contain anything, which cannot, decidedly, be explained from John's character, or the composition of the gospel in the latter part of his life."

quite ingenious, to say nothing more. He supposes they all grew out of one simple story. "We have, then, a group of five histories, the centre of which is the narrative of a woman anointing Jesus, (Matt. xxvi. 6, seq.; Mark xiv. 3, seq.) John's account of the sinful woman, (viii. 1 seq.,) and Luke's of Mary and Martha, (x. 38, seq.,) occupy the extreme right and left; while Luke's picture of his anointing by a sinful woman, (vii. 36, seq.,) and John's, by Mary, (xii. 1, seq.,) complete the piece. All may be but different delineations of the same event.

We come next to the miracles of Jesus. Miracles of various kinds were commonly expected of the Messiah, who was to surpass all the former prophets and deliverers. Now Moses had furnished food and water in a miraculous manner; Elisha had opened the blind eyes, healed the sick, and raised the dead. The prophets had predicted nearly the same things in general, and some of them in special, of the Messiah, (Isaiah, xxxv. 5; xlii. 7,) and according to the Gospels Jesus did more than realize these expectations. The fact that men demanded "a sign" from him proves nothing against his miracles, for these demands seem to have been made after a display of miraculous power. He censures the love of miracles; but this does not prove he would never perform one on a suitable occasion. But when he says no sign shall be given unto that generation, &c., Mr. Strauss concludes *he refuses to perform any miracles whatever* before any of his contemporaries. This statement is quite inconsistent with the miraculous narratives in the Gospels, but it agrees perfectly well with the preaching and letters of the Apostles; for there, (excepting a general statement in Acts ii. 22, and x. 38,) the miracles are passed over in silence, and all rests on his resurrection; and this would not be so unexpected, nor would it make an epoch in the world, if Jesus had previously raised more than one from the dead, and wrought miracles of all sorts. Here, then, the question is, whether we are to explain away the gospel accounts of miracles, for the sake of the above refusal of Jesus to perform them; or doubt the genuineness and authenticity of this refusal; or in consideration of that refusal, and the silence of the apostolical writings to mistrust the numerous miracles of the Gospels. The author devotes above two hundred and fifty pages to miracles in general and particular. We shall notice only some of his most striking remarks.

It was a common opinion of the Jews, that certain diseases were caused by demons; Jesus himself seems to have shared this opinion. The belief, of course, is not well founded. Some of the accounts, in which Jesus is said to expel these demons, are self-contradictory; for example, it cannot be true that there were *two* Gadarene madmen, so fierce as they are represented, who yet lived together. They would destroy one another. Mark and Luke, with greater probability, mention but one demoniac, in this place. These several accounts, which conflict with one another, present numerous difficulties. The demoniac knows Jesus is the Messiah, in Matthew; *he calls out*, "Hast thou come to torment me?" &c.; in Luke, *he falls down and worships* Jesus, and in Mark, *he knows him at a distance*, runs to him, and does homage. Here is a regular climax in the Christian tradition. But the greatest difficulty consists in the demon entering the swine; for, as Olshausen has said; the Gadarene swine in the New Testament, like Balaam's ass in the old, are a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence. If we trust the account, the demon, at his own request, was transferred from the body of the man to the swine, and *possessed* the latter as he had done the former. Then the possessed animals rush into the sea and are drowned. Here the conduct of the demon is inexplicable; he entreated not to be cast out into the deep, but casts himself into it. The character of Jesus is impaired by this story; for he must have known the result of suffering the demons to enter this large herd of two thousand swine, and the consequent loss their owners would sustain. He, therefore, is thus made "accessory before the fact," and the naturalistic and supernaturalistic theories can give no satisfactory explanation of the difficulties. But considered as a mythical story, which grew naturally out of the common opinions of the people, it is easily explained. It was commonly supposed that demons must possess some body, and that they preferred impure places; therefore the unclean bodies of the swine were the most suitable recipients of the demons when driven from the man. Josephus mentions a conjuror, who, to convince spectators that he really expelled demons, ordered them to overturn a vessel of water, set near the possessed men, as they came out of him, which they did to the satisfaction of all present. Jesus meant to give a similar proof, and to render the proof doubly strong, the test is not an inanimate body, placed near at hand, but a whole herd of swine, "a good way off," which the demons force to rush

upon certain destruction, contrary to the instinct of self-preservation natural to all animals. This, then, was a proof of the expulsion of the demons, and of their perfect subjection to Jesus. Besides, to magnify the powers of Christ, he must not only cure simple, but difficult cases. Accordingly, this is represented as a desperate case; the man was fierce and malignant; he dwelt naked in the tombs, and broke asunder all chains that could be forced upon him; and not only this, but he was possessed by a whole legion of devils, thus presenting a case of the greatest possible difficulty. Matthew gives us the most simple form of the legend, thus constructed; Luke renders it more artificial, and Mark adds still further embellishments to it.

John mentions nothing concerning the demoniacs or their cure. Yet he must have shared the common Jewish notions on this point, and especially if they were the views of Jesus. It cannot be said, he omitted these cases, which form a great part of Christ's miracles in the Synoptics, because it was unnecessary to repeat what they had recorded, for he more than once allows himself such repetitions; nor can it be true, that he accommodated himself to the delicate ears of his Greek converts, to whom demoniacal possessions would be offensive. It seems, therefore, that the fourth Gospel was written not by John, but by some one who drew from the Christian tradition as received by the more refined Hellenists.

Another case of expelling a demon is evidently an imitation and improvement of a similar case in the Old Testament. The disciples had failed in their attempt; but Jesus cures him at a word. So Elisha restores a dead child after Gehazi, his servant, had tried in vain, (2 Kings, iv. 29, seq.) Moses and Elisha had cured the leprosy; the Messiah must do the same. He also must literally fulfil figurative predictions of the prophets, and give sight to the blind. John enlarges upon the statements of the Synoptics, and makes him cure a man *born* blind. They relate that he cured paralytics, and increased bread, and restored a dead person; but John enlarges these wonders, and according to him, Jesus cures a man who had been diseased for *thirty-eight* years, *changes water into wine*, and recalls to life a man *four days after his death*, when the body was on the verge of dissolution.

Mr. Strauss supposes the accounts of Jesus involuntarily curing such as touched him, — as it were by a species of magnetic influence, — and even persons at a distance, whom he had never

seen, are mythical stories, which have grown out of the popular reverence for Jesus. He places them on a level with similar stories in the Acts, of miraculous cures wrought by Peter's shadow, and Paul's handkerchiefs and aprons, (Acts v. 15 ; xix. 11, 12.) "It is not difficult to see what causes have produced this branch of the gospel legends of miracles, in distinction from the others. The weak faith of the people, unable to grasp the Divine Spirit with the thoughts, strives to bring it down more and more to the level of material existence. Therefore, according to the later opinion, the reliques and bones of a saint must work miracles after his death ; Christ's body must be actually present in the transubstantiated bread and wine, and for the same reason, according to the earlier opinion, the sanatory power of the New-Testament-men adhered to their bodies, and even their garments. The less men understand and adhere to the words of Jesus, the more anxious will they be to seize upon his mantle, and the further one is removed from sharing Paul's unconfined spiritual power, the more confidently will he carry home Paul's gift of healing in his pocket-handkerchief."

Mr. Strauss examines the several accounts where Jesus is said to raise the dead, and finds a climax in the three instances mentioned ; first, he restores a *girl, on the bed* where she had died ; next, a *young man in his coffin*, before burial ; and finally, Lazarus, who had *been dead four days, and was in the tomb*. He enumerates all the difficulties that beset a literal or mystical, natural or supernatural interpretation of the passages, and concludes that all the stories grew out of popular notions of the Messiah, or are copied from the similar stories of Elisha's wonderful works (1 Kings xvii. 7 ; 2 Kings iv. 18,) or from the predictions of the prophets.

He collects and dwells upon the difficulties of the alleged transfiguration of Jesus. What was the use of this scene ? Not to glorify Jesus, for this physical glorification is unnecessary and childish. Why or how could Moses and Elijah appear to him, and for what purposes ? Not to inform Jesus of his death ; he had himself foretold it ; not to strengthen him for future troubles, for it did not effect this object ; and we do not know that he needed aid at that time ; not to confirm his disciples, for only *three* were present, and they were asleep, and were not permitted to relate the events until after the resurrection. Does God speak in an audible voice, and quote from the Old Testament ? The theories of interpreters of the various

schools are in part absurd, and all inadequate to remove the difficulties. But the whole story has grown out of the Messianic expectations of the Jews, and an imitation of scenes in the Old Testament. The Jews expected the Messiah would appear with a face far more resplendent than that of Moses, — “a mere man ;” his splendor would extend “from one hinge of the world to the other,” was the poetic expression. Moses had been glorified on a mountain, God had appeared to him in a cloud. The same scene is repeated, and Jesus is glorified on a mountain, in presence of the two representatives of the Jewish system, who were expected to appear. Moses and Elijah, the founders of the theocratical law, and of theocratical prophecy, appear as the supporters of the Messiah, who fulfils the law and the prophets, and completes the kingdom of God. God appears in the clouds ; and acknowledges him as his son, by a quotation from the law, the Psalms, and the Prophets. (Ps. ii. 7 ; Isa. xlii. 1 ; and Deut. xviii. 15.)

We will now mention only the death, and final scenes of the life of Jesus. Mr. Strauss thinks he could not have had so accurate a foreknowledge of the manner of his suffering and death, as the evangelists would lead us to suppose. The prediction was written after the event. Jesus could not definitely have foretold his resurrection from the dead, for then the disciples would have expected the event. But after the crucifixion they anoint the body, as if it was to become the “prey of dissolution.” When they repair to the grave, they think not of a resurrection ; their only concern is, who shall roll away the stone from the mouth of the tomb ? Not finding the body, they think it has been stolen. When the women mention the angels they had seen, it is idle talk to the disciples ; when Mary Magdalene, and two others, assured the disciples they had seen the “risen Jesus,” their words produced no belief. It is only when Jesus appears in person, and upbraids them for their unbelief, that they assert as a fact, what they would have foreknown if he had predicted it. A foreknowledge or prediction of this event was ascribed to Jesus after the result, not from any intention to deceive, but by a natural mistake. He thinks, however, that Jesus actually predicted his own second coming, in the clouds of Heaven, the destruction of the Jewish state, and the end of the world ; all of which were to take place before his contemporaries should pass away. Here, following the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist, he says there is no prophecy in the whole Bible

so distinct and definite as this, and yet it is found obviously and entirely false. We attempt to fill up the great gulf between this prediction and the fact, and our hope of success shows how easy it must have been for the author of these predictions to suppose, that soon after the destruction of the Jewish state, — supposed to be the central point of the world, — the whole earth should come to an end, and the Messiah appear to judge mankind.

John, who is supposed to have written later than the others, does not mention so distinctly these predictions, because they had not come to fulfilment as it was expected. Mr. Strauss thinks Jesus at last saw that his death was inevitable, and designated the next passover as the probable end of his life, and while at table with his disciples gave them the bread and wine, either as the symbols of his body, soon to be broken by death, and of his blood, soon to be shed ; or as a memorial of himself. He considers as mythical, the account of his going *three* times to pray, and repeating the same words at Gethsemane, as well as that of the angels' visit, and the bloody sweat.

Many of the circumstances which, it is related, accompanied the trial and crucifixion, he sets aside as mythical additions, borrowed in part from the Old Testament. He maintains that the supernatural appearances at the death of Jesus ; the sudden and miraculous darkness ; the resurrection of the bodies of the saints ; the earthquake, and the rending of the veil, have all grown up in the mythical fashion. The latter is symbolical of removing the wall of separation between the Gentiles and Jews. He thinks it quite improbable the Jews would set a guard over the tomb, as it is not probable they had heard of the promise of Jesus to rise from the dead ; a promise which the disciples themselves did not remember, until after it was fulfilled. The Jews, he thinks, in later times, pretended that Jesus did not rise from the dead, but that his disciples stole the body by night, secreted it, and then pretended he was risen ; and the Christians, to counteract this statement, gradually formed the evangelical narrative, that the door of the tomb was sealed, and a guard set over it ; but Jesus was raised, and to throw dust in the eyes of the people, the great national council bribed the soldiers to assent to a very improbable falsehood, that the disciples stole the body, while they slept. But it is not probable a body of seventy men would condescend to such open wickedness, with the almost certain chance of detection.

He enlarges at great length, and with acuteness, and some "special pleading," which is not altogether rare in the book, on the confusion of the statements in the four Gospels concerning the time, place, and circumstances of the resurrection, and the several appearances of Jesus, after that event, passing through closed doors; appearing under various forms, and, like a spirit, remaining with them but a short time, and then vanishing out of sight. But the fact of the resurrection itself, Mr. Strauss says, involves difficulties, and cannot be admitted. We must, then, suppose, with the rationalists, either that he was not dead; or that the resurrection did not take place. He accepts the latter part of the dilemma, and thinks the disciples were mistaken, led astray by the figurative passages in the Psalms and Prophets, which they erroneously referred to the Messiah. The testimony of the Gospels and the book of Acts, he says, is so inconsistent, contradictory, and imperfect, that we can place no dependence upon it, and that of Paul, which is consistent with itself, and of great weight, only assures us of his own conviction, that Christ rose and appeared to men, and even to himself. But Christ's appearance to Paul was entirely subjective, and there is no reason to believe he supposed Jesus had appeared to others in an objective manner, visible to the senses. Mr. Strauss fancies the narratives originated in the following manner. The disciples, thinking the Messiah must remain forever, thought he must have arisen; next, they had subjective visions; then, in a high state of enthusiasm, they mistook some unknown person for him. Afterwards, as these disciples related their convictions, the story was enlarged, embellished, and varied, until it assumed the form of the present canonical and apocryphal gospels. The ascension to Heaven, which many have hitherto rejected as not trustworthy, is regarded by Mr. Strauss as a myth, which derives its ideas from the histories and predictions of the Old Testament, and Jewish tradition, and with a particular reference to the alleged translations of Enoch and Elijah.

The author adds a "Concluding Treatise" to his critical work, "For the inward germ of Christian faith is entirely independent of critical investigations; the supernatural birth of Christ, his miracles, his resurrection and ascension to Heaven, remain eternal truths, however much their reality, as historical facts, may be doubted." (Vol. I. p. xii.) All these he supposes are realized not in an historical personage, but in the

VOL. XXVIII. — 3D S. VOL. X. NO. III. 39

human race. Mankind have unconsciously projected out of themselves, the ideal of a perfect man, an incarnation of God, a personification of morality and religion. This Ideal has been placed upon Jesus, a man distinguished for great virtue and piety. But neither he nor any man ever did, or can realize the Idea; it must be realized in the race. The history of the miraculous conception, says one of the profoundest of the Germans, represents the divine origin of Religion; the stories of his miracles, the independent power of the human soul, and the sublime doctrine of spiritual self-confidence. His resurrection is the symbol of the victory of Truth; the omen of the triumph of the good over the evil, hereafter to be completed. His ascension is the symbol of the eternal excellence of religion; Christ on the cross is the image of mankind purified by self-sacrifice. We must all be crucified with him, to ascend with him to a new life. The idea of devotion is the ground-tone in the history of Jesus; for every act of his life was consecrated to the thought of his Heavenly Father.

We can only glance at the contents of this concluding treatise. It gives a fundamental criticism of the Christology of the Orthodox, the Rationalists, of the Eclectics, of Schleiermacher, Kant, and De Wette, and the speculative theology of Hegel and his followers. He points out the merits and defects of these various systems, and concludes his work with an attempt to reconcile, in some measure, his own views of Christ with the wants of religious souls, and the opinions of others. He thus concludes; "Setting aside, therefore, the notions of the sinlessness and absolute perfection of Jesus, as notions that could not be realized perfectly by a human being in the flesh, we understand Christ as that person, in whose self-consciousness the unity of the Divine and Human first came forth, and with an energy, that, in the whole course of his life and character, diminished to the very lowest possible degree (*bis zum verschwindenden Minimum zurückdrängte*) all limitations of this unity. In this respect he stands alone and unequalled in the world's history. And yet, we do not affirm, that the religious consciousness, which he first attained and proclaimed, can, in its separate parts, dispense with purification and farther improvement, through the progressive development of the human mind." (Vol. II. pp. 771 - 779, 3d edit.)

Having thus given a patient, and we hope faithful account of the principles, method, and most striking results of this celebrat-

ed work, it may not be amiss to point out some of the false principles, which have conducted the author to his extreme conclusions, though we think their extravagance answers itself. We see no reason to doubt that he is a religious man *in his own way*, nay, he calls himself a Christian, and so far as his *life* is a test, we know not why the name should be withheld. His *religion* and *life* may have the Christian savor, though his *theology* be, — what it is. We know there are fascinations which a paradox presents to daring souls, and we are told there is a charm to a revolutionary spirit, in attempting to pull down the work, which has sheltered the piety, defended the weakness, and relieved the wants of mankind for a score of centuries, when it is supposed to rest on a false foundation. Yet we doubt not that Mr. Strauss is honest in his sad convictions, and has throughout aimed to be faithful and true. We cannot, therefore, as some have done, call him “the Iscariot of the nineteenth century ;” we cannot declare him “inspired by the devil,” nor accuse him of the “sin against the Holy Ghost ;” nor say that he has “the heart of leviathan, hard as a piece of the nether mill-stone.” We judge no man’s heart but our own. However, the erroneous principles which lead to his mistaken conclusions may be briefly glanced at.

1. He sets out, as he says, without any “presuppositions.” Now this is not possible, if it were desirable, and not desirable, if it were possible. But he has set out with presuppositions, namely, that the Idea precedes the man, who is supposed to realize that idea ; that many men, having a certain doctrine, gradually and in a natural manner, refer this doctrine to some historical person, and thus make a mythical web of history. He presupposes that a miracle is utterly impossible. Again he presupposes, — and this is an important feature of his system, — that the Ideal of Holiness and Love, for example, like the Ideal of beauty, eloquence, philosophy, or music, cannot be concentrated in an individual. In a word, there can be no incarnation of God ; not even of what, in a human manner, we call his Love, or Holiness. We could enumerate many other presuppositions, but forbear.* He explains his meaning in the controversial replies to his opponents, but does not satisfy us.

* See *Ullmann Historisch oder der Mythisch. Beiträge zur Beantwortung der gegenwärtigen Lebensfrage der Theologie*. Hamburg: 1838. p. 62, seq. *De Wette l. c. Tholuck Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte zugleich eine Kritik des Lebens Jesu von Strauss*. 1838. p. 26, seq.

2. He passes quite lightly to the conclusion, that the four Gospels are neither genuine nor authentic. Perhaps it is not fair to enumerate this among his *presuppositions*, though we know not where else to place it; certainly not in the catalogue of *proofs*, for he adduces no new arguments against them; decides entirely from internal arguments, that they are not true, and were not written by eye-witnesses, and pays no regard to the evidence of Christian, Heretical, and even Heathen Antiquity, on some points in their favor. The genuineness of Paul's most important epistles has never been contested, and the fact of the Christian Church stands out before the sun, but the convictions of the one and the faith of the other remain perfectly inexplicable, by his theory.*

3. The book is not written in a religious spirit. It will be said a critical work need not be written in a religious spirit, and certainly those works, — and we could name many such, — which aim at two marks, edification and criticism, usually fail of both. They are neither wind nor water; are too high for this world, and too low for the next; too critical to edify; too hortatory to instruct. That anicular criticism, so common on this side the waters, deserves only contempt. But a philosophical work should be criticised philosophically; a poetical work, in the spirit of a poet, and a religious history in a religious spirit. The criticism of Schleiermacher and De Wette is often as bold, unsparing, and remorseless, and sometimes quite as destructive as that of Strauss; but they always leave an impression of their profound piety; the reader can trust them to anatomize and extirpate as deeply as they will, knowing that the essential part of the religious document will never be removed. We will not question the religious character of Mr. Strauss; a Christian like Dr. Ullman, his own countryman, does not doubt it; but we do not see marks of its presence here, even if we sometimes find proofs of it elsewhere.

4. His mythical hypothesis has carried him away. Fondness for theory is "the old Adam of theology," and Strauss has inherited a large portion of "original sin" from this great patriarch of theological errors, — this father of lies. To turn one of his

* See the necessary "presuppositions," laid down by *De Wette*, *Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch zum N. T. B. I. Th. 3*, concluding treatise on the historical criticism of the Evangelical History. Leip.: 1837. p. 214, seq.

own war-elephants against himself, he has looked so long at mythical stories, that, dazzled thereby, like men who have gazed earnestly upon the sun, he can see nothing but myths wherever he turns his eye, — myths of all colors. This tendency to see myths is the *Proton Pseudon*, the first fib of his system. It has been maintained by many, that the Bible, in both divisions, contained myths. Some of his own adversaries admit their existence, to a large extent, even in the New Testament. But with them the myth itself not only embodies an *Idea*, as Strauss affirms, but also covers a *fact*, which preceded it. Men do not make myths out of the air, but out of historical materials. Besides, where did they obtain the *Idea*? This question he answers poorly. Shaftesbury long ago said, with much truth, that if a Hebrew sage was asked a deep question, he answered it by telling a story; but the story, for the most part, had some truth in it. Strauss is peculiar in carrying his theory farther than any one before him; yet he is not always perfectly true to his principles; his humanity sometimes leaves a little historical earth clinging to the roots of the tree, which he transplants into the cold thin atmosphere of the Absolute. Taking the Bible as it is, says good Dr. Ullmann, there are three ways of treating it. We may believe every word is historically true, from Genesis to Revelations; that there is neither myth nor fable — and this is the theory of some supernaturalists, like Hengstenberg and his school; or with Strauss, that there is no historical ground, which is firm and undeniably certain, but only a little historical matter, around which tradition has wrapped legends and myths; or, finally, that the Bible, and in particular the New Testament, always rests on historical ground, though it is not common historical ground, nor is it so rigidly historical that no legendary or mythical elements have entered it. The two former theories recommend themselves, for their simplicity; but neither can be maintained, while the third is natural, easy, and offends neither the cultivated understanding nor the pious heart.

It is wonderful, we think, that some of the absurdities of the theory Mr. Strauss supports have not struck the author himself. He reverses the order of things, makes the effect precede the cause; the idea appear in the mass, before it was seen in an individual, "As Plato's God formed the world by looking on the eternal ideas," so has the community, taking occasion from the person and fate of Jesus, projected the image of its Christ, and unconsciously the idea of mankind in its relations to

God, has been waving before its eyes." He makes a belief in the resurrection and divinity of Christ spring up out of the community, take hold on the world, and produce a revolution in all human affairs perfectly unexampled ; and all this without any adequate historical cause. No doubt theologians in his country, as well as our own, have attempted to prove too much, and so failed to prove anything. Divines, like kings, lose their just inheritance, when they aspire at universal empire. But this justifies no man in the court of logic, for rejecting all historical faith. If there was not an historical Christ to idealize, there could be no ideal Christ to seek in history. We doubt if there was genius enough in the world in the first two, or the first twenty centuries since Christ, to devise such a character as his, with so small an historical capital. Christian critics, says De Wette, will not be satisfied with knowing as much respecting Christ as Paul and the apostles knew. No one of them, though they were eye-witnesses, had such a complete, consistent, and thoroughly historical picture of the life of Christ, as we seek after. Many of the primitive Christians could scarcely know of Christ's history, a tenth part of what our catechumens learn, and yet they were more inspired and better believers than we. It is much learning, which makes *us* so mad ; not the Apostle Paul.* But if we cannot *prove* all things, we can hold fast to enough that is good.

Mr. Strauss takes the idea, which forms the subject, as he thinks, of a Christian myth, out of the air, and then tells us how the myth itself grew out of that idea. But he does not always prove from history or the nature of things, that the idea existed before the story or the fact was invented. He finds certain opinions, prophecies, and expectations in the Old Testament, and affirms at once these were both the occasion and cause of the later stories, in which they reappear. This method of treatment requires very little ingenuity, on the part of the critic ; we could resolve half of Luther's life into a series of myths, which are formed after the model of Paul's history ; indeed, this has already been done. Nay, we could dissolve any given historical event in a mythical solution, and then precipitate the "seminal ideas" in their primitive form. We also can change an historical character into a symbol of "universal humanity." The whole history of the settlement of New England, for ex-

ample, we might call a tissue of mythical stories, borrowed in part from the Old Testament; in part from the Apocalypse, and in part from fancy. The British government oppressing the Puritans is the great red dragon of the Revelations, as it is shown, by the national arms, and by the British legend of Saint George and the Dragon. The splendid career of the new people is borrowed from the persecuted woman's poetical history, her dress — "clothed with the sun." The stars said to be in the national banner, are only the crown of twelve stars on the poetic being's head; the perils of the pilgrims in the Mayflower are only the woman's flight on the wings of a great eagle. The war between the two countries is only "the practical application" of the flood which the dragon cast out against the woman, &c.* The story of the Declaration of Independence is liable to many objections, if we examine it *a la mode* Strauss. The congress was held at a mythical town, whose very name is suspicious, — Philadelphia, — Brotherly Love. The date is suspicious; it was the *fourth* day of the *fourth* month, (reckoning from *April*, as it is probable the Heraclidæ, and Scandinavians; possible that the aboriginal Americans, and certain that the Hebrews did.) Now *four* was a sacred number with the Americans; the president was chosen for *four* years; there were *four* departments of affairs; *four* divisions of the political powers, namely, the people, the congress, the executive, and the judiciary, &c. Besides, which is still more incredible, three of the presidents, two of whom, it is alleged signed the declaration, died on the *fourth* of July, and the two latter exactly *fifty* years after they had signed it, and about the *same hour* of the day. The *year* also is suspicious; 1776 is but an ingenious combination of the sacred number, *four*, which is repeated *three* times, and then multiplied by itself to produce the date; thus, $444 \times 4 = 1776$, Q. E. D. Now dividing the first (444) by the second, (4) we have *Unity* thrice repeated (111.) This is a manifest symbol of the national *oneness*, (likewise represented in the motto, *e pluribus unum*,) and of the national *religion*, of which the Triniform Monad, or "Trinity in Unity" and "Unity in Trinity" is the well known sign!! Still farther, the declaration is metaphysical, and presupposes an acquaintance with the transcendental philosophy, on the part of the

* We borrowed this hint from a sermon heard in childhood, "opening this Scripture," explaining this prophecy, as relating to America.

American people. Now the *Kritik of Pure Reason* was not published till after the declaration was made. Still farther, the Americans were never, to use the nebulous expressions of the Hegelites, an "idealo-transcendental-and-subjective," but an "objective-and-concretivo-practical" people, to the last degree; therefore a metaphysical document, and most of all a "legal-congressional-metaphysical" document is highly suspicious, if found among them. Besides, Hualteperah, the great historian of Mexico, a neighboring state, never mentions this document; and farther still, if this declaration had been made, and accepted by the whole nation, as it is pretended, then we cannot account for the fact, that the fundamental maxim of that paper, namely, the soul's equality to itself, — "all men are born," &c. &c. was perpetually lost sight of, and a large portion of the people kept in slavery; still later, petitions, — supported by this fundamental article, — for the abolition of slavery, were rejected by Congress with unexampled contempt, when, if the history is not mythical, slavery never had a legal existence after 1776, &c. &c. But we could go on in this way forever. "I'll" please "you so eight years together; dinners, and suppers, and sleeping hours excepted; *it is the right butter-woman's rank to market.*" We are forcibly reminded of a ridiculous prediction of Lichtenberg, mentioned by Jacobi; "Our world will by-and-by become so fine that it will be as ridiculous to believe in a God, as now it is to believe in ghosts; and then again the world will become still finer, and it will rush hastily up to the very tip-top of refinement. Having reached the summit, the judgment of our sages will once more turn about; knowledge will undergo its last metamorphosis. Then — and this will be the end — we shall believe in nothing but ghosts; we shall be as God; we shall know that Being and Essence is, and can be only, — Ghost. At that time the salt sweat of seriousness will be wiped dry from every brow; the tears of anxiety will be washed from every eye; loud laughter will peal out among men, for Reason will then have completed her work; humanity will have reached its goal, and a crown will adorn the head of each transfigured man." *

* This quotation seems to be a classic common-place against all new schools. Jacobi applied to it Idealism and Nature-Philosophy, and both Tholuck and Hengstenberg cast it upon Strauss. A writer in the *Princeton Repertory* "sips the thrice-drawn infusion," and gives the passage a new application.

The work of Strauss has produced a great sensation in Germany, and especially in Berlin. It has called forth replies from all quarters, and of all characters, from the scurrilous invective to the heavy theological treatise. It has been met by learning and sagacity greater than his own, and he has yielded on some points. The volume of his controversial writings,* and still more, the third edition of his great work, proves that he is a lover of truth; that his mind is still open to conviction, for he has given up many positions, some of great importance. He has retorted upon some of his antagonists, using the same weapons with which they assailed him. He has even turned upon them, and carried the war into their borders, and laid waste their country, with the old Teutonic war-spirit. We have never read a controversy more awful than his reply to Eschenmeyer and Menzel. Porson's criticism of poor Mr. Travis was a lullaby in comparison. But he has replied to Ullman, — a Christian in heart, apparently, as well as in theology, — as a child to a father. His letters to this gentleman are models for theological controversy. He has modified many of his opinions, as his enemies or his friends have pointed out his errors, and seems most indebted to Neander, Tholuck, Weisse, Ullman, and De Wette, not to mention numerous humbler and more hostile names.

His work is not to be ranked with any previous attacks upon Christianity. It not only surpasses all its predecessors in learning, acuteness, and thorough investigation, but it is marked by a serious and earnest spirit. He denounces with vehemence the opinion that the Gospels were written to deceive. There is none of the persiflage of the English deists; none of the haughty scorn and bitter mockery of the far-famed Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist. He is much more Christian in expressing his unbelief than Hengstenberg in his faith. We could wish the language a little more studied in some places. Two or three times he is frivolous; but in general, the style is elevated, and manly, and always pretty clear. We do not remember to have met with a sneer in the whole book.

The work derives its importance not so much from the novelty of its views, as from the fact that it is a concentration of objections to historical Christianity. Viewed in this light, its importance has by no means been exaggerated. It is some-

* *Streitschriften zur Vertheidigung meiner Kritik*, 1837 - 8; 3 Hefte, 8vo.

times said, had the work been published in England, it would have been forgotten in two months ; but no man who has read the book, and is familiar with the history of skepticism, ever believes such a statement. We should be glad to see the English scholars, who are to measure swords with a Strauss, as the Cudworths, Warburtons, Sherlocks, Lardners, and Clarkes encountered their antagonists in other days, when there were giants among the English clergy.

" 'T is no war as everybody knows,
Where only one side deals the blows,
And t' other bears 'em."

We have no doubt which side would "bear the blows" for the next five-and-twenty years, should any one be provoked to translate Strauss to a London public. Yet we fear not its ultimate, but only for its present triumph.

We cannot regard this book as the work of a single man ; it is rather the production of the age. An individual raised up by God discovers a great truth, which makes an epoch, and by its seminal character marks the coming ages. But a book like this, which denotes merely a crisis, a revolution, is the aggregate of many works. Like Kant's *Kritik*, it is the necessary result of the great German movement, as much so as Spinoza's theological treatises were of the Cartesian principles ; and, indeed, the position of Strauss is in many respects not unlike that of Spinoza. Both mark a crisis ; both struck at the most deeply cherished doctrines of their times. Before mankind could pass over the great chasm between the frozen realm of stiff supernaturalism, and lifeless rationalism, on the one side, and the fair domain of *free religious thought*, where the only *essential* creed is the Christian motto, "Be perfect, as your Father in Heaven is perfect," and the only *essential* form of Religion is Love to your neighbor as to yourself, and to God with the whole heart, mind, and soul, on the other, — some one must plunge in, devoting himself unconsciously, or even against his will, for the welfare of the race. This hard lot Strauss has chosen for himself, and done what many we fear wished, but none dared to do. His book, therefore, must needs be negative, destructive, and unsatisfactory.● It pleases no one. It is colder than ice. It is the most melancholy book we ever read. All nature was dark to us as we closed and finished it. If the author rests in his conclusions, he is but another Herostratus, who could sport

in the ashes of the temple he had burned, while others wept at the glory that was gone. But it only marks a period of transition. No nation, and least of all a German people, can rest in it. Let it not be supposed Strauss is an exponent of the German school of theology or religion, as it is sometimes unwisely urged. He is a single element in a vast mass. His work finds opponents in the leaders of the three great Protestant theological parties in Germany. The main body of theologians there is represented by Schleiermacher, Tholuck, Neander, De Wette, and men of a similar spirit. Strauss is the representative of a small party. He is by no means the representative of the followers of Hegel, many of whom are opposed to him.*

The whole book has the savor of Pantheism pervading it, as we think, using Pantheism in its best sense, if our readers can find a good sense for it. He does not admit a personal God, we are told, and, therefore, would not admit of a personal Christ, or incarnation of God. This, we suspect, is the sole cause of his aversion to personalities. But he nowhere avows this openly and plainly; we, therefore, only give it as our conjecture, though Tholuck openly calls him a Pantheist of the school of Hegel, defining that school "Atheistic;" while Ullmann brings the same charge, but with much more modesty, asking men to translate it more mildly if they can.

We are not surprised at the sensation Mr. Strauss has excited in Germany, nor at the number of replies, which have been showered down upon him. Destruction always makes a great noise, and attracts the crowd, but nobody knows when the Gospels were published, and the world, doubtless, was in no great haste to receive them. It is fortunate the book has been written in the only country where it can be readily answered. We have no fears for the final result. Doubtless, some will be shaken in their weakly rooted faith; and the immediate effect will probably be bad; worse than former religious revolutions with them. The Rationalists took possession of the pulpit, but unlike Strauss, says Mr. Tholuck, they pulled down no churches. But we have no fear that any church will be destroyed by him. If a church can be destroyed by a criticism, or a book, however

* See, for example, an article on the second volume of the "*Leben Jesu*," in the Berlin "*Jahrbucher für Wissenschaftliche Kritik*," for 1836. Band I. p. 681, seq., by Rosenkrantz.

pungent, the sooner it falls the better. A church, we think, was never written down, except by itself. To write down the Christian Church seems to us as absurd as to write down the solar system, or put an end to tears, joys, and prayers. Still less have we any fear, that Christianity itself should come to an end, as some appear to fancy; a form of Religion, which has been the parent and the guardian of all modern civilization; which has sent its voice to the ends of the world; and now addresses equally, the heart of the beggar and the monarch; which is the only bond between societies; an institution, cherished and clung to by the choicest hopes, the deepest desires of the human race, is not in a moment to be displaced by a book. "There has long been a fable among men," says an illustrious German writer, "and even in these days is it often heard; unbelief invented it, and little-belief has taken it up. It runs thus; there will come a time, and, perhaps, it has already come, when it will be all over with this Jesus of Nazareth; and this is right. The memory of a single man is fruitful only for a time. The human race must thank him for much; God has brought much to pass through him. But he is only one of us, and his hour to be forgotten will soon strike. It has been his earnest desire to render the world entirely free; it must, therefore, be his wish to make it free also from himself, that God may be all in all. Then men will not only know that they have power enough in themselves to obey perfectly the will of God; but in the perfect knowledge of this, they can go beyond its requisitions, if they only will! Yea, when the Christian name is forgotten, then for the first time shall an universal kingdom of Love and Truth arise, in which there shall lie no more any seed of enmity, that from the beginning has been continually sown between such as believe in Jesus, and the children of men. But this fable can never be true. Ever, since the day that he was in the flesh, the Redeemer's image has been stamped ineffaceably on the hearts of men. Even if the letter should perish, — which is holy, only because it preserves to us this image, — the image itself would remain forever. It is stamped so deep in the heart of man, that it never can be effaced, and the word of the Apostle will ever be true, 'Lord, whither shall we go? thou only hast the words of eternal life.' " *

* While we have been preparing these pages, we have sometimes glanced at another book, attacking Christianity. Its title is Jesus-Christ

ART. II. — *The Foundation of Christianity in the Wants of the Soul*; being the Dudleian Lecture, delivered before the University in Cambridge, May 13th, 1840. By the Rev. W. B. O. PEABODY.

JOHN IV. 14. — THE WATER THAT I SHALL GIVE HIM SHALL BE IN HIM A WELL OF WATER SPRINGING UP UNTO EVERLASTING LIFE.

THE subject assigned for this lecture is Revealed Religion; and the purpose of the Founder, as I understand it, was, to provide for such a discussion of the subject, as should tend to confirm the hearers in their conviction of the truth of Christianity. The original evidences of the religion of Jesus Christ, I shall not now bring before you. That subject is in abler hands than mine. I shall content myself with making some suggestions, which, so far as they have any weight, will strengthen the confidence that our religion shall endure, and that the gates of hell, — that is, the councils of destruction, — shall not prevail against it.

Our Saviour in conversing with the Samaritan woman, compared his religion to a living fountain within the breast. Because it is internal it shall not perish like outward and visible things. This is the emphatic part of the sentence, — it shall be *in him*, and because it is in him it shall continue to flow forever. We cannot be supposed to feel what the power of that illustration was in a climate where the broad rivers shrank to silver threads, and the earth was parched and blackened by the summer sun. But the truth which it conveys, and the promise which it contains within it, are clear to every eye, —

et Sa doctrine, Histoire de la Naissance de l'Eglise, de son organization et de ses progrès, pendant le premier siècle, par J. Salvador. Paris: 1838. 2 vol. 8vo.; a work of great pretensions and very little merit. Unfortunately another attack upon Christianity has fallen into our hands, with the title, Examen du Mosaisme et du Christianisme, par M. Reghelin de Schio. Paris: 1834. 3 vol. 8vo. If any unfortunate reader should chance, in a luckless moment, to open this book, we advise him to bathe instantly in the "living stream," and submit to all the Levitical purifications; for a book more unclean and hateful was never devised, by mortal man, we trust. We have cut only three or four of its infamous leaves; but have felt a frightful sense of defilement ever since touching it. Only stupidity, uncleanness, and impiety, could have produced a work so vile.

the promise that religion, being an internal principle, shall not share the fate of those things which perish with the using, and pass away. The same thing which makes it permanent in single hearts, ensures its perpetual duration in the world; and in times when the moral aspect of the world indicates strong tendencies to infidelity, such a promise, based on a familiar truth, serves to encourage the hopes of believers.

But whence comes this confidence? Why are we so sure that the stream which our Saviour drew from the rock in the wilderness will never cease to flow? Do we think that the hope of heaven and the fear of hell will always make men Christians? Do we suppose that many who reject Christianity now, will be driven to it for consolation in their dark and troubled hours? Or do we take encouragement from beholding how it has grown out of small beginnings, and overspread the civilized world? No doubt these things help our confidence. But the foundation of it is, that man wants Christianity; there is a thirst in the soul which no other element will supply. He must turn to some invisible power above him; he cannot confine his aspirations to the beings about him, and the present world. Having these wants, he cannot give up Christianity, the only religion which professes to supply them, or ever acknowledges their existence. By the unquestionable testimony of works, which no one could do unless God were with him, Jesus assures him that he is divinely sent to the world, sent on purpose to supply this hunger and thirst of the soul for more than man and this earth can give.

We so often speak of communicating religion to others, and of receiving it from others, that we sometimes forget that the feelings and desires addressed by Christianity are all natives of the heart. They are in us from the first, folded up and dormant, certainly, but still they are there. The same inspiration which gave us life and understanding, gave us those capacities, to which the word of inspiration appeals. Every man has a power to discern distinction between good and evil; between the right and the wrong. Every man, too, has those powers, which are called spiritual; which, when awakened to action, make him acquainted with unseen or spiritual, as the bodily senses make him acquainted with material and visible things. There is in every soul from the beginning something which tends to look forward to a hereafter, and upward to a power above.

The language which we use on this subject deceives us, as language is apt to do. When we teach others, our children, for example, we say it is to inspire religious feelings in their hearts. The feelings are there already ; and it is our part to educate or draw them into action, and to direct them to the subjects which ought to engage them. We can do little more than point out the way. It is God who gives them the power to go. Religious education is the training of those spiritual powers and affections, which reside in every breast ; which lie folded in the young, and in the thoughtless and hardened of our race are not dead, but sleeping ; which, if we call upon them, arise and answer to the summons of a friendly voice ; but which, if not called into action from without by some being who is interested in their welfare, may lie unexerted till the trumpet wakes the dead.

This, then, is the truth, that the religious feeling lies deep in our nature, ready to welcome the disclosures of Christianity as soon as it knows that God has sent them from above. You appeal to the moral sense and the religious feeling in others ; and their moral sense and religious feeling start up from their death-like slumber. When you bring your children to reflect upon the subject, it is not an external process, the work is done within, for well does inspiration say, that the fountain of devotion must be *in him*, within the man, or it cannot flow unto everlasting life. When you go to some poor hardened wretch, and try to touch his heart, you feel that your words are powerless, and that nothing you can say will make the least impression ; yet at that very moment, perhaps, the religious feeling is waking ; it is something within himself, which rises up and masters him ; his fierce defiance sinks away, his tears begin to fall, — his own spirit is in action and will do the rest ; for to wake him to a sense of his guilt and danger is all that you can do.

A great and inspiring truth this ! that the thirst for religion is born in the human breast. Stifled and suppressed it may be, — stifled and suppressed indeed it is ; buried deep both in single hearts and great communities, under a crushing weight of meaner interests and passions. Still it is there ; and had we a divining rod for the purpose, we could find the living spring under all the worldliness that surrounds us. We are told that engineers are now sounding the Asiatic deserts with Artesian wells ; and they are sure to find the element far down beneath the sands that are whitened by the suns of ages. And those,

who, in the name of Jesus Christ, have gone into moral deserts, into those howling wastes of abandoned men in which the world abounds, exploring the haunts of sensual excess, the caverns of the dungeon, and the lanes of poverty, have found that if not weary in well doing, they could set springs of devotion flowing even there; all was not evil; the veriest rocks of the wilderness have melted under the touch of holy and gentle hands.

If these things are so, — and they are so, — who can have any fears for Christianity? Infidelity has no sympathy with our nature. It makes no provision for the thirst of the soul. It knows no such wants; but such wants there are, and the faith which does not supply them is no religion for man. Such wants there are, and Christianity, the only faith which satisfies them, cannot be lost. It may at times be overlooked, for it springs apart from the dusty wayside of life. It may be undervalued, for none can estimate it aright but those who have made trial of its power; but, like the element to which our Saviour likened it, it is essential and indispensable; man cannot do without it; and, therefore, it will continue to flow long after the sun has withdrawn his shining, and the stars are pale with age.

Having stated what is the foundation of our confidence that our religion shall endure, let us next inquire if there is any reason for those fears which many have, lest it shall perish from the souls of men. There is encouragement in those very fears. For you may observe that nothing is apprehended from assaults of unbelievers without; all the fear is, of unsoundness and decline within; that is, lest men should of themselves abandon it, and let it die. And it certainly is true that it can spread no faster than men give it welcome; it dies if men suffer it to die. Though the truths of Christianity are eternal, religion, which is the feeling arising from the recognition of those truths, may perish, if men will have it so. But for the reasons just given, we are sure that this can never be; the same wants which have made them embrace it through the two thousand years that are nearly past, will make them continue to embrace it, through the numberless years and ages that are yet to come.

One reason of these fears is, the extravagance and excess of opinion, to which Christians often go, — not those, who use their deliberate reason, and take their conscience with them, — but those who speculate with fanciful rashness, and snatch a

fearful joy in seeing how far they can venture to go. Such tastes and tendencies always have been found in the Christian world: but the experience of all ages proves, that they do no lasting injury to the cause of Christian truth. To those who engage in them, and those who adopt them, serious injury may be done, and for their sakes it is well that efforts should be made to resist them; but those speculations, and the controversies which follow, can no more destroy the existence and power of Christian truth in the world, than the crimson cloud of the battle-field can quench the orb of day. Active and free thought is the element in which truth lives, and moves, and has its being. Let us never, from the fear of seeing things unsettled, hope for a dead, level calm. If the broad ocean were covered with the verdure of stagnation, it would seem more firm and settled than it does now; and yet such a calm would be more fearful to the mariner than the wildest storm that ever swept the sea. Better that the waves should roll, even if here and there a vessel founders. Better, immeasurably better, to see the intellectual elements in motion, than to see them sleeping! Anything is better than indifference. In the most diseased convulsive action of life there is hope; in the repose of death there is none.

Neither is the number and variety of religious opinions a sign of danger to the cause of Christianity. It is desirable that men should be of one mind and one heart; but not that they should be of one opinion. If it were so in reality, it would show that their minds are not in action; if they were so only in profession, it would show that they are not free. This number of opinions is owing to the spread of light; in lands of ignorance and darkness all is uniform; but variety comes with intellectual improvement, and increases as that improvement extends. Do I not know as I look on the landscape, now, when the spring comes in the brightness of its rising, over hill and valley, do I not know the cause of all this beauty? At night there is cold uniformity in the aspect of nature, like that which the bigot covets for the religious world. But variety comes with the morning; things which the darkness blended into one, separate and take form, like wax beneath the seal; as the sun rises the lights and shadows increase in depth and number, till every leaf of the woodland shows its own peculiar green. Why fear the time when each man shall have his own opinion? It is not well that one overshadowing system should, by influence

or power, keep down the independence of the mind. If men think for themselves, they will not think alike ; but they will not give up the right ; and God forbid that they should.

Another reason why some have fears for Christianity is, that they see no permanency about any sect or party. To every member, or I should say, to every slave of a sect, his own sect seems the whole Christian body. So long as it flourishes, he thinks that all is well with religion ; but as soon as it dwindles in influence and numbers, he verily believes that Christianity itself is going down. While such is the feeling of party men, no wonder that there are fears. Still they are uncalled for. By a law of nature every sect seems to live its day, some a longer, others a shorter ; still, it is a day that has an end at last. Looking over the past history of religion, you find recorded the names of many whose day is over ; they answered a purpose, perhaps a good purpose in their time ; but the hour came when they were no longer needed ; and when no good purpose could be served by their continued existence, they accepted their death-warrant and passed away. Some are now breaking up, and a cry rises from the midst of them, as if Christianity itself were dying. But is it so ? Is the hope of religion staked on the existence of any exclusive party ? Oh no ! These are natural and familiar changes, no more threatening ruin to Christianity, than the breaking up of the ice in spring bodes destruction to the river. They cease to exist, because they have accomplished all the ends of their existence ; they pass away because their use is over ; and to detain them longer would be as unnatural and impossible as to withhold a corpse from the grave.

This is the light in which parties should be regarded. They are not beneficial as many think them, nor are they as pernicious as is often supposed. Each one has its portion of truth ; some more, others less ; but each one has its part ; the portion of truth which it has, is its vital principle, and without it, the party could not live an hour. The errors of the party do not stifle the truth ; the truth works under the error, works itself clear, like a living spring ; so far from the party destroying the truth, the result is precisely the reverse ; the truth prevails over the errors at last, and in time destroys the party. Dying, it gives place to some other, which rises and reigns in its stead ; that one, in its turn, shall give place to some other, and the same succession shall go on, till the time arrives when there shall be

one fold and one shepherd, and truth shall be the same in every party, the same in every breast.

Again. Human creeds and forms of faith are passing by ; and as each one is given up, its advocates feel as if all the solemnity of religion went with it. Invariably, when the believer of a creed is compelled by the force of truth to give it up and take the Bible alone for his standard, he feels as if all the solemnity of religion was gone. If it is so indeed, if all his religion was in his creed, and not in his life and spirit, he is in danger, and he cannot find it out too soon. So far as respects his faith, he has made a decided improvement ; the former did not answer the purpose of religion to him, and possibly the new one may. So when there is a change in the faith of numbers, whatever the first fruits may be, it is owing to that law by which partial views of truth give way to those which are more extensive and enlightened. It is well that they perish ; they might otherwise have remained standing in the way of truth, but now as each one goes, its place is in time supplied with another, not absolutely true, but nearer truth than the former.

But why, says the advocate of creeds, may I not regard my creed as containing all Christianity ; in fact, as identical with Christianity ? Turn to the world of nature, there it is, you have it all before you. Why not regard your scientific descriptions as complete, and say that observers in coming time will have no more to discover ? Because, as you well know, those descriptions embrace, not all that there is, by any means, but only all that men have yet learned. And so the creeds of Christian sects embrace, not all that there is, but only all that they have learned. The succeeding age will know more. The creeds of future sects will embrace more light and truth than ours ; and as new light is continually breaking from the word of God, we may hope that the world will grow more and more enlightened, till it shines and rejoices in the perfect day.

Thus it appears that the fate of creeds and parties is not discouraging. It shows, on the contrary, that Christianity is prevailing with growing light and power. No one dreams that the spirit of man dies, when the frame in which it is for the time embodied sinks into the dust. We believe rather that the destruction of the body is release and translation to the soul. So when the creed in which a portion of Christian truth is embodied begins to lose its hold ; when the members of the sect chal-

lenge, suspect, and condemn each other, till party and creed together become a hopeless ruin, the portion of truth which it possessed remains ; it is gathered into the great treasury of mankind ; no longer hidden in the dark lantern of a narrow association, it sheds abroad its light to the whole Christian world.

It is clear, then, that what are often regarded as indications of the decline of Christianity, are signs rather of its progress ; it is throwing off every weight, redeeming itself from human inventions, and preparing to extend and be glorified in the world as it never yet has been. So far from being lost, it will come into nearer intimacy with the human heart. In what forms it will manifest itself in coming time, it is not ours to say. It will not probably manifest itself in new forms, so much as an indifference to forms compared with realities, — not such an indifference as is found and sometimes boasted among us now, — not the indifference of those to whom religious forms are an unmeaning language, because they have never known the feelings which those forms express ; but the indifference of those who are so profoundly impressed with the substance and spirit of Christianity, that if a man's heart is in his religion, they care not in what dialect he prays, whether he stands or kneels in devotion, whether he holds a creed or governs his life by the Scriptures alone — they are glad to see any form in which the faith can gain for itself a warmer welcome in any heart. But I do wrong to use the word indifference in connexion with such a feeling as this ; it is rather an interest in all forms which breathe the true spirit of those who use them ; its watchword is, Christ is preached, and I therein do rejoice. It makes believers friendly to the whole-hearted of every party, — it allows them to be unkind and unjust to none.

And now let me ask, have you ever reflected, that when our Saviour likened his religion to a living spring, he compared it to the most durable of earthly things. Fleeting and perishable as it seems, there is nothing more enduring. Many a wayfarer goes to the land where Jesus lived, a region made so sacred by his presence, that men have called it the Holy Land. They look for Samaria, the great city of the kings ; they find nothing save the well where Jesus talked with the Samaritan, and see women coming as in past ages, to draw from it in the heat of the day. They find no vestige of Tyre ; the city whose merchants were princes, but the same waves welter round the lonely shores, and the fisherman spreads his nets upon the

desolate rock. They seek for Jerusalem as it was ; but the daughter of Zion is changed ; the crown is fallen from her brow ; the holy and beautiful house is gone forever ; while the fountain of Siloam, fast by the oracle of God, flows full and bright as in the day when the priests filled their golden urns from it, singing " with joy ye shall draw water from the wells of salvation." The traveller asks for the ruins of Capernaum, where our Saviour made his home. Once it was exalted to heaven in its pride ; now there is not a stone to show the place of its grave ; while the sea of Tiberias, where he called his disciples, and where he reprov'd the winds and waves and they obeyed him, still spreads out its blue waters, though for ages, no dashing oar has broken the slumber of its tide.

He meant that his religion should endure ; and, therefore, he would not write it with an iron pen in the rock forever ; he chose rather to have it engraven on the only immortal thing in this world ; and that is the heart of man. The heart and impressions made in it will endure forever. This is the reason that Christianity still exists, while cities, kingdoms, and empires have passed away. This is the reason, that it shall endure unchanged, when rocks and mountains shall melt, and the earth shall be a scorched and blackened ruin. It cannot perish like the works of man and the visible elements of nature. It is an immortal fountain to supply the thirst of the soul forever.

**ART. III. — LOCAL VESTIGES OF THE EARLY PROPAGATION
OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE CITY OF ROME.**

THE local testimonies of the evidences and the effects of Christian truth, at its first propagation among the nations and cities of the earth, present us with many interesting materials for serious thought. There are vestiges on the face of nature, and in the edifices of ancient cities, of apostolic labor and martyrdom. We read in the Acts of the Apostles, that after Paul had made his noble defence at Jerusalem, while he was confined by night in the castle, " the Lord stood by him, and said, Be of good cheer, Paul ; for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome." At Jeru-

saalem, Paul had begun his work, but Jerusalem was only a city in a despised province of one mighty empire. To Rome, as the seat of universal dominion, his thoughts were now turned. All interests were then centred in that imperial city. Through the whole known world the name was familiar, and to all nations it had attractions. Science and art, pleasure and philosophy, looked to Rome for excitements and novelties. How calmly does the Apostle utter his resolution to carry there the lessons of that new faith to which he was to die a martyr. The words of the humble Galilean were to be preached upon the seven hills of the all-conquering city of the Cæsars, and in the midst of the statues and temples of heathen worship, the Father Almighty was to be adored. After the lapse of eighteen centuries, during which the faith has triumphed, we can scarcely conceive the circumstances attending that apparently trivial event of the visit of Paul to Rome.

It is uncertain by whom the Gospel was first preached in that city. Our sacred books contain an epistle of Paul to the converts already made there. The date of this epistle is assigned to the spring of the year of our Lord 58. It is evident from it that Paul had not as yet visited the city. He tells the converts that he had often purposed to come to them, but had hitherto been prevented. Soon after he had written the letter he was carried there as a prisoner. After a restraint of two years he again travelled upon his labors for five years, when, upon his return to Rome, he suffered martyrdom, about the year 65. Only they who have closely studied his Epistle to the Romans, and have illustrated it by some knowledge of the time and the place, can truly estimate its sublime and solemn instruction. Some strangers from Rome had been present at Jerusalem at the feast of Pentecost, and are mentioned among those who were startled and impressed by the miraculous events of that day. When they returned to their home they carried back with them the story of what they had seen and heard. Among the thousand novelties which for a day or a year kept in motion the curiosity and interest of the inhabitants of Rome, it was scarcely to be supposed that the tale of a few wanderers would receive much credit. In a state of society corrupt to the very core, where only individual hearts were touched by virtue, where only shows of blood and scenes of gayety could move a listless and fatigued sensuality, there was but small place for the leavening influence of a mild and simple faith. But he that

reads understandingly the Epistle to the Roman Christians, will be impressed by the solemn appeals, the strong arguments, the eloquent exhortations of that lesson of divine counsel addressed to the conquerors of the world. Written by one who thoroughly knew the pagan faith, who acknowledged whatever little power it might possess to touch the feelings, but who realized how poorly its shrines, and statues, and sacrifices could fill the desires of a human soul, that epistle first breathed the breath of life into dead bones. Who were the first to read it, with what slow and uncertain faith they interpreted it, only our imaginations can inform us.

But the Apostle Paul not only wrote to the Roman Christians, he visited them in person. Soon after sending his epistle, he was imprisoned in Jerusalem, and here he appealed from the unjust decision of an inferior officer to the Roman Emperor. The dangerous voyage of the Mediterranean, the appearance of Paul before the Roman Jews, and his two years' confinement in his own hired house, are all minutely detailed in the Acts of the Apostles. A year after he was set at liberty, there occurred that disastrous conflagration in Rome, for which Nero is considered chargeable. On the testimony of the profane historian, Tacitus, we learn that the Christians were already very numerous and very much contemned in Rome, so that the populace permitted their cruel sacrifice by excruciating deaths, when Nero accused them as the authors of the devastation. Milman, in his recent History of Christianity, suggests,* that some "incautious or misinterpreted expressions of the Christians themselves might have attracted the blind resentment of the people. The minds of the Christians were constantly occupied with the terrific images of the final coming of the Lord to judgment in fire; the conflagration of the world was the expected consummation, which they devoutly supposed to be instantly at hand." Mr. Milman, with great ingenuity and probability, imagines, that the more fanatical, the Jewish part of the Christian community, may have looked with fierce and eager exultation upon the great Babylon of the West, blazing in one vast sheet of devouring flame. They may have dropped some unguarded and triumphant language, have attributed the ruin to the vengeance of the Lord, have hailed it as the opening of his kingdom, and have gloried in their own hope, in the

* Vol. II. p. 36.

midst of the common misery. The city of idolatry and blood was blazing like a furnace before them, and they alone looked upon it with joy and hope. Thus they may have excited the rage of their tormentors, and have been put to the excruciating sufferings, which, we are told by an historian of the times, who would not deign to examine their faith, they obstinately endured. This was the occasion of the first heathen persecution of the Christians.

Four years afterwards, while Paul was at Corinth, Nero, that monster of cruelty, went thither to witness its celebrated games, and the Apostle, according to tradition, used the opportunity to revisit Rome, where, after a short imprisonment, he was put to death by "the freed slave, Helius, a fit representative of the absent tyrant." As a Roman citizen he was beheaded, rather than ignominiously executed on the cross.

These are facts in history, which connect the early Christian faith with the scenes of human life. A deeply interesting train of thought passes through the mind as it identifies the places, which, with any reasonable degree of certainty, are consecrated as connected with the first propagation of Christianity. Our faith, drawn from books, from education, and from meditation, will linger around a hallowed spot, and be revived even by the stones and the soil.

But now, in our first efforts to specify any consecrated localities, we are met with an exhibition of human frailty, which ever seems to mingle with the best of human means and purposes. Our readers need scarcely be informed, that in the history of Christianity, we very frequently meet with the phrase, "*pious frauds*," namely, falsehoods and deceptions invented and repeated, with the hope of confirming faith; evil done that good may come of it; fictions and tales circulated among the ignorant for the sake of terrifying or convincing them. The early history of the Church is deformed by a thousand legends and artifices, the purpose of which, namely, faith, was supposed to justify the means, namely, falsehood. The scenes of apostolic labor and of Christian martyrdom are overloaded with monkish tales and with absurd superstitions. Every Catholic church in the world possesses some alleged relic, not only of Christian apostles, but of ancient patriarchs, sometimes even of angels and of the Saviour, and there are a thousand localities in Rome, believed by the common people to be thus invested with heavenly glory. Not only the chains and instruments of mar-

tyrdom, and the bones and ashes of saints, are kept in reverent care, but there are likewise exhibited miraculous fountains, and the footsteps of heavenly messengers upon the solid stone. Some of these deceptions are, of course, in open defiance of historical fact. For instance, Eusebius expressly states that Constantine deferred his baptism, intending to have it performed in the Jordan, but dying suddenly of an ague at Nicomedia, the service was there performed on the day upon which he expired. Yet in connexion with the Church of St. John Lateran, is a splendid Baptistry, maintained by Catholics to have been erected and first used by Constantine. In the same church are exhibited the skulls of Peter and Paul, the well-stone of the woman of Samaria, the table, upon which the Saviour celebrated the Last Supper, the pillar, to which he was tied when scourged, and that upon which the cock was perched, when Peter was reminded of his denial. There is also a large slab supported by four stone pillars, the space beneath which is alleged to be the exact height of the Saviour, and it is added by the priest who exhibits it, that no individual has ever exactly fitted the interval. It is hard to say whether there was any sincerity mingled with the fraud in the mind of him who fabricated this last mentioned relic, for the sole purpose of deceit. Very near by is an edifice erected expressly for the reception of twenty-eight blocks of Tyrian marble, now encased in oak, said to have been those which conducted to Pilate's judgment hall. At least a hundred persons daily ascend those stairs upon their knees, to obtain an indulgence of three thousand years from the pains of purgatory, which is promised upon a large placard at the bottom. The altar-piece at the summit is a picture of the Saviour, attributed to St. Luke and some angels. These may serve as specimens of a thousand deceptions, yet more gross and revolting, which are presented in every church in Rome.

Here, as elsewhere, may we realize the issue of all deception, even though it assume the name of "pious fraud." The true effect of a consecrated scene is wholly lost in the ridicule and disgust which many most absurd triflings with sacred things excite. It is altogether probable that among the heterogeneous mass of relics gathered in Rome, some may be genuine. Disciples of Christianity early made their way thither; and if in the time of the Saviour there were some who thought there was sanctity in the hem of his garment, confirmed believ-

ers, when persecuted, must have clung closely to any sacred relic. One of the nicest points of casuistry is to settle the measure of credence due to a tradition; the boundary lines of fact and fable are distinguished with difficulty. There may be in Rome some relics which have been handled by apostles, but a reasonable man will soon decide how the small certainty of detecting any of these should be entirely set aside, if such a number of falsehoods meet him at every spot. Relics, by retaining devotion upon themselves, withdraw it from God and truth, and by prompting an observance which the senses can discharge, such as a pilgrimage, or a bending of the knees, they fail to strengthen principles of constant conduct. Yet if every overgrown, nonsensical, and perverted fable were to be traced far back to a few simple elements, to institutions designed in earliest times by affectionate hearts as tributes of a commemorative love for the Saviour and his truth, we should find something upon which we might dwell with sincere delight. A valuable lesson is taught us in these perversities, by cautioning us to guard against the multiplication of symbols and of forms, which tend by force of their own attractive, and in some cases by force of their repulsive power, to outgrow and supersede the truths they were intended to aid.

Yet there are some scenes in the ancient capital and mistress of the world, which may truly be associated with the Apostles and martyrs of our faith. History, tradition, and local evidence of different kinds attest them. Stones, and caverns, and the green soil have recorded and transmitted the story of human faith, which has made them forever sacred.

With strong grounds of probability from fact, and from well attested tradition, there is still pointed out at Rome the prison in which St. Paul was confined, previous to his martyrdom. We know, from his own epistles, that he was a prisoner at Rome, expecting his death. On the southern slope of the Capitoline Hill, beneath a church, called S. Pietro in Carcere, are two dungeons called the Mamertine prisons. They lie one immediately above the other. The upper one was constructed by Ancus Martius, the fourth king of Rome, about six and a half centuries before our era. Servius Tullius added the lower one, for the punishment of the worst criminals, and from him it was called the Tullianum. They are both about thirty feet by twenty, and about fourteen feet high. The Emperor Augustus repaired them about twenty-two years before the birth of Christ.

They were the only public prisons in Rome, and many state offenders and conspirators, vanquished enemies and foreign criminals were confined there. Here Jugurtha starved, Sejanus was slain by order of Tiberius, Perseus king of Macedonia was imprisoned, and likewise Jonas son of Simon, the chief of the Jews, by order of Titus. The accomplices of Catiline were confined here before being put to death on the Roman forum.

Pious fraud has busied itself with this locality, and by a most absurd fabrication, repeated in solemn tones by a monk, who exhibits the prison, excites a smile from those, who, with only the probable tradition connected with the spot, would have been deeply impressed. A fountain of clear water gushes from a spring in the lower prison, and is said to have sprung up miraculously, that Paul while confined here might baptize his gaolers and forty-seven fellow prisoners, who all subsequently died as martyrs. As if here was not marvel enough, there is likewise shown upon the surface of the solid stone wall, by the side of the steps which connect the dungeons, the deeply marked profile of a human countenance, the nose, chin, and other features being perfectly delineated. The monks say, that as the gaoler was leading the Apostle to the lower prison, the latter uttered a sentiment which provoked the keeper to strike him upon the head against the wall, and thus left an ineffaceable mark of the countenance of Paul. The cavity is protected by bars of iron, lest devout worshippers should kiss away the impression. As might be supposed, the shrine is much revered. In a small chapel behind the church, and immediately over the entrance to the dungeons, are inscriptions recording the miraculous history of the spot, and never can a stranger enter that chapel without observing many individuals adoring and praying, in apparently an absorbed devotion.

Such are the sights and tales which meet us as we enter that prison, and revolve in our minds the strong reasons of probability for a part of the history which is attached to it. It may have been from that damp and gloomy cell that Paul wrote to Timothy his last message of affectionate counsel. The city, which had attractions for all others, had none for him. One friend he had found there who had "oft refreshed him, and was not ashamed of his chain," and he implores a blessing upon the house of Onesiphorus. One simple sentence of his own simple language tells how even partial converts had received the lessons

which he taught in his public trial ; " At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me ; I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge." But in the midst of his loneliness and desertion, and out of his deep prison, he utters the calm and tranquil peace of his soul. It may have been there, that the following words of sublime and affecting power were penned. " For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my work, I have kept the faith ; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness," &c.

The spot where the Apostle suffered martyrdom is likewise pointed out, and over it is erected a costly church, in which are standing miracles more ridiculous than credible. The locality may be correct, but the idle tales concerning the three fountains beneath the church are too absurd to be here repeated.

Next in the order of time, among the durable monuments of Christian interest in Rome, may be named the triumphal arch of sculptured Pentellic marble, erected by the Senate and People of Rome, in honor of Titus, after his return from the destruction of Jerusalem. It is a single arch, crossing the Sacred Way, and surmounted by an attic. Originally, both fronts were adorned with four fluted columns of the composite architecture, which have now disappeared. The frieze represents the triumphal procession of the conqueror with a river god, supposed to figure the Jordan. In the centre of the internal roof, an eagle is bearing Titus to heaven, in attestation of his apotheosis. Upon one side, within the edifice, the sculpture represents the conqueror as seated in a car drawn by four horses, crowned with laurel by Victory, and guided by the genius of Rome. On the other side, the sacred vessels of the Jewish temple, the seven-branched golden candlestick, the tables of the law and of the show bread, the jubilee trumpets, and the vessel for incense, are cut deep in the marble, from the original spoils of the plundered sanctuary. No possible doubt can attach to their originality or their fidelity. The arch and its ornaments were all completed within less than twenty years after the destruction of the temple. An unbroken line of authors have referred to this melancholy token of the desolation of the proudest and most sacred shrine which the earth has ever beheld. There have been thousands of Jews in Rome ever since the destruction of their city, as there are still, and the proud arch

crosses a principal thoroughfare of travel, but no Jew ever passes beneath it. They profess to believe that instantaneous death would be visited upon any one of them, who should come so near to the monument of their country's desolation and disgrace.

How solemnly down the stream of long ages does that pile of stone, raised by human pride, and decorated with the spoils of a haughty but majestic faith, how solemnly does it confirm the prediction, that, in the fulness of time, a Gentile race should overthrow the ceremonial code of ancient worship, to prepare the way for a simple faith, which addressed and convinced the heart. Even the teeth of time seem to respect the venerable relic ; that ages yet in the far distant future may confirm from it the lessons of the dim past.

Josephus says the veil and the tables of the law were placed in Cæsar's palace, and the other treasures in the Temple of Peace, which was built for their reception, and the ruins of which are close at hand. When that splendid edifice was burned, the treasures were saved. The golden fillet is said to have been seen in the days of Hadrian. When Genseric sacked Rome, he took some of the treasures to Africa. Belisarius again seized them from him, and used them for his triumphal entry into Constantinople, and after all, Justinian presented them to different Christian churches in Jerusalem. History thus follows them back to their own home, and there they are lost.

Rome, too, is the scene of many Christian martyrdoms. The blood of true and faithful converts has stained its soil. The Christian never can forget that amid the proud monuments and temples of that ancient capital, the first confessors of the faith wandered as strangers, despised and persecuted. The most gigantic structure ever erected, and still remaining in the city, is the amphitheatre, or colosseum. Its stupendous walls, in part removed when the Roman barons of the middle ages used the edifice as a quarry, from which to construct their palaces, are now protected from ruin, because the arena is consecrated to the memory of the sainted martyrs who perished there, mingling their dying prayers with the howl of infuriated beasts. That enormous structure, conceived in dire cruelty, was completed in the year 80, of our era. One hundred thousand spectators could at the same time behold its fearful spectacles, and it was dedicated to its purpose by shows that con-

tinued one hundred days, and witnessed the agonies of four thousand beasts and human beings. Among the victims of that dread arena were the iron-nerved gladiators, nurtured in the wild mountains, and reared from infancy with strength of limb and ferocity of heart, to grapple in a death struggle with each other, or with wild beasts from the hot deserts of Africa. These were willing victims. Slaves and conquered foes, and the hated followers of the new sect, were forced upon those sands, to give forth their life-blood in agony.

It is at midnight, by the light of the moon, and the glare of torches, that the awful impression of that cruel relic comes full upon the soul. No single moon can light up the whole of that vast pile. A part of it must always be night, in a shadow as dark as its own fearful history. The lesser ruins around it, are a fit introduction to its imposing terror. There night is always thoughtful, darkness is solemnizing, and the stupendous relic of nearly eighteen centuries produces on the mind an impression never to be effaced. There is the place, and then is the time, of all others, to form one living idea of what is meant by the progress of Humanity towards truth and virtue, under the guidance of Christian principles. That ruined amphitheatre is the giant skeleton, the monumental centre, of all that remains of heathen Rome, its ambition and its triumphs, its cruelty and its religion. It is a desolation and a wreck. The thin mantle of beauty with which hoary antiquity and decay have invested it, cannot veil its terrific and brutal purpose. The great ruling passion of the human heart in old times expressed itself on that spot. It was blood; the sight of bitter agony endured with a proud heart, the view of a composed countenance, and of a hard-nerved fortitude, while racking pains were exhausting the life-blood. The death-shriek of the gladiator, the agonized prayer of a tortured Christian, the deafening roar of the thousand tormentors, who heard them all, with a smile, — there was the past, — a distant, but not forgotten past. Ask now the ruling passion and energy of the present day; put innocence for blood, and good for evil, and the interval between, will show what is meant by the progress of Humanity. The traits of character which then stood first, now stand last. Then the earth rang with one mad and universal cry of blood; now the cry is for the soul of man, his whole soul, and the souls of all men. It is from the dying prayer, the well tried faith of Christians, who stained that arena with their blood, that the change is to be

dated. Through one of the broken arches of that vast pile, the moon always darts a single pure ray of light, which falls like a bright spark upon the wide blackness of the arena. Perhaps it shines upon a spot where a martyred Christian quivered in his last pang. There is more light in the heavens, and that ray came from a source which shall illumine the whole earth.

There are other consecrated localities, solemn and melancholy in their character, and beyond question or dispute in the sanctity attributed to them. Such are the catacombs, which were at once the burial places of the martyrs, and the humble and secret chapels of early Christian worship. Deep beneath the soil of Rome, and winding off into labyrinths of unknown extent, excavations were made in times before the birth of Christ, for a species of earth or sand, now called *pozzonala*, from which was made the durable cement used by the Romans. As the material ran in narrow veins, rising, dipping, and bending irregularly, it was sought out in galleries of only sufficient size for the operation of procuring it, and when exhausted in one place, the excavation was left to neglect, and forgotten. The galleries are about six feet in height, and three in width; they have been traced for many miles, and there are several entrances to them. As they are not lighted by any air holes or openings, and are very devious and confused in their windings, many persons have perished in them, so that most of the entrances have been closed. The principal access to them now is beneath the church of St. Sebastian, outside of the walls. At intervals are larger spaces, or chambers, for the convenience of the workmen. Under the name of *arenariæ*, these catacombs are mentioned by Cicero and Suetonius. It has been a matter of heated controversy, whether or not the heathen Romans used these dark and gloomy recesses for the purposes of sepulture. The probability is, that the Christians were the first to put them to this service, and that their example may have been soon followed by their pagan fellow citizens. The Romans burned their dead; the patricians apart, the plebeians in the common field, which is now well defined. The Christians abhorred this practice. Along the sides of these galleries, rising in tiers above each other, are horizontal recesses, of the size of the human body, covered with slabs of marble. On these may now be read the first Christian inscriptions, and within the recesses lie the remains of the early martyrs and disciples of the

faith. Many of these slabs remain in the catacombs, but several have been deposited in the galleries of the Vatican. There is no deception or mistake in the touching mementos of these rude inscriptions. There may be seen in Rome thousands of cinerary urns and tombs, which inclose pagan dust. These are inscribed to many gods, to the deities of the shades, and are ornamented with beautiful, though vain symbols. How impressive the contrast between these stones, which speak of darkened minds and hopeless sorrows, and the first rude sculptures of a Christian faith over the ashes of a martyr or a confessor. The slabs of marble over the Christian tombs, discard the pomp of epitaphs. They merely express the prayer that the sleeper "may rest in peace," and give the length of his earthly pilgrimage, generally with a monogram, formed from the two letters P. X., "pro Christo," or "positum in Christo." Sometimes there is added a rude representation of a cluster of grapes, a dove of peace, a palm branch, a bow of promise, a fish, or the letters *A. Ω.* Some have supposed that the letters *X.* and *P.* are intended to designate the first two letters of the Greek word for Christ. The following are some of the most simple inscriptions, still to be seen; — "Domiti in Pace; Lea Fecit," — "O Domitius! mayst thou rest in peace; Lea did this." "*Αφθονα εν Θεω ζησης*," — "Aphthona! mayst thou live in God." "Farewell! O Sabina! She lived viii. years, viii. months, xxii. days. Mayst thou live sweet in God."

While these recesses served the purpose of graves, a vase by their side often contained the blood of the martyr, and the sponge with which it was gathered up. The larger excavations were the resort of the persecuted worshippers, when only a tomb could conceal them.

Even in these spots, where there is so much of truth, invention and forgery are employed. By some it is pretended that the Christians constructed these immense catacombs for the express purpose of a resting place for the martyrs. An inscription in the Church of St. Sebastian asserts that 174,000 of the sufferers rest beneath it. An immense traffic has been carried on in the bones gathered from these repositories; and the whole Catholic world has been supplied from this store-house, through the agency of Popes and cardinals. Most of the recesses have been rifled to supply with some alleged relic the altars of the faithful, and it is probable, indeed certain, that the bones and ashes of pagans and Christians, martyrs and persecutors, aged

men and still-born infants, plebeian Romans and Christian bishops, have been promiscuously adored.

Yet there is no manner of doubt as to the tradition and the history which distinctly fill out the tale of those simple inscriptions, and assert that in these dark chambers the first Roman Christians worshipped, and in those neglected galleries were laid the mangled remains of the martyrs, and the bodies of early believers. St. Jerome, about the middle of the fourth century, speaks of the catacombs as consecrated antiquities, which he frequently visited on Sundays, while he was pursuing his studies at Rome, with other youths. He regarded them with deep reverence. Prudentius, a Spaniard, in a visit which he made to Rome a few years later, loved to wander amid these solemn testimonials; and he wrote upon them, and the men and scenes associated with them, many beautiful hymns.

Here, then, far from the merriment, impiety, and folly of the proud city, seeking the caverns of the earth for a hiding place, the Christians first uttered the prayers and sang the hymns of that faith, which is now honored over the whole civilized world. There is a scene for which neither history nor romance have a parallel. When the despised faith was slowly making individual, and but partially instructed converts among the humble ranks of Rome, the first conviction of the heart was accompanied by a full apprehension of its cost, and a sense that belief and danger would come together. The abstracted and downcast look of the new convert, as he walked among the monuments of victories and the temples of heathen gods, his ear profaned with unholy oaths, and his heart aching with the constant presence of foul corruption, marked him out for suspicion. He would not worship with the aid of idols; his God had no representative image, nor asked oblations of blood; he could not clasp the hand, nor drain the cup of friendship, if he must accompany his pledge with an appeal to many deities; and, therefore, he was called an atheist. He shared not in the love of conquest, nor in the pride of triumphs, nor in the cruel sports of the amphitheatre, nor in the impure orgies of the pagan year, and, therefore, he was looked upon as a cheerless misanthrope. Even when persecuted, he returned neither threat nor blow, and he was, therefore, regarded as a spiritless coward. The wonderful incidents upon which he based his faith had originated in the despised province of Judea, and thus the Christian was held to be only a sectarian Jew. But with the

Jew the Christian would not hold company, and thus he was believed to lack the last redeeming virtue of a knave or a culprit, sympathy with his fellows. Thus regarded, the Christian passed amid the throng, alienated, as it would seem, from the land of his birth, and from the companions of his daily life. Few would risk the pollution of his society, for to speak with him excited suspicion. Then was the time for the first and perfect display of unknown human virtues. Then the inmost soul of man was driven to live upon energies before hidden, and now revealed only as mysteries. What a sincere and blazing testimony was then borne to Christian truth, in the triumph over ancient prejudice, and the unflinching courage of endurance. There were then no private homes where a beloved hearth could be consecrated by prayer. The household comprised the sternest enemies; kindred and friends were the fiercest persecutors. The parent and the child knew not the same God. Even the worship of the Father was a startling office to those whose knowledge of him was but of yesterday; and sympathy of heart, most longed for by every sufferer, was rare. But no experience of loneliness or sorrow could quench the kindling fire of faith. Those who inherit Christianity by birth and education cannot know the intense estimate in which it was held by its first converts. Here and there it was the loved treasure of one heart, and that heart consecrated to it hope and life. Yet the precepts of the faith, and the desire of the soul that cherished it, alike pointed to the work of conversion. Not only must the Christian expose himself to scorn and sorrow, but the business of his life must now be to invite others to share with him his convictions and their cost. Affection, which would designate the first subjects of his labor, would at the same time interpose the strongest argument to damp his zeal. His fondest wish would be to gather the whole circle of home and friendship into the fold of the Saviour; yet nature would dissuade him for involving in a lot, whose bitter sorrows he best could estimate, the loved and familiar companions of his daily life. But such a work was not given to them without aid from the author of their faith, and from the sensibilities of the hearts to which it was addressed. There were some who would listen to the despised Christians, though the conference was in gloomy darkness. The respect which sincerity inspires would often cower the purpose of a traitor, when conviction did not reach his heart. They did not forget the assembling themselves to-

gether. The midnight meeting in the tombs was made known to all who might safely be admitted. The damp and unwholesome sepulchre was loved, as no gorgeous temple has since been. The worshippers often gathered around the mortal remains of a fellow believer who had fallen upon the arena. With the mementos of mortality around them, they thought of heaven. The brief endurance of the body was meditated by its crumbling ashes; the undying energy of the soul was witnessed in the sincerity of its deep trust. Even the fragment of a Gospel or an Epistle was then a dear-bought treasure, and it was read as the last legacy of those who had gone before them in suffering. Infants were offered in baptism; the prayer and the hymn joined all hearts; the sacramental feast, the oath of constancy, the pledge of fellowship, joined all hearts in one, and they issued from their hiding-place, either to die by violence, or to bear their secret burdens.

Such were the beginnings of the faith in that proud city whither the Apostle was warned to go by a vision of the night. The blood of the martyrs has been the seed of the Church; sown deep in sorrow and tears, let it grow and flourish for the healing of the nations. The proud city is in ruins, the faith upon which it trampled lives.

G. E. E.

ART. IV. — *Frithiof's Saga, or The Legend of Frithiof.*

By ESAIAS TEGNER. Translated from the Swedish.

OUT of a rational interest in the literature of our own country grows a rational curiosity respecting that of others; and from the gratification of this curiosity spring many important influences. To read much without being affected in intellectual or moral character, in feeling or tastes, is impossible; hence the fine scholar usually rises the wiser and better from his studies; and, if true to his responsibilities, often becomes the channel, through which streams of fresh wisdom and goodness flow in upon his countrymen, blessed with less of leisure and opportunity. How many of the truths and beauties floating in the world's literature of the present century have come

down from a shadowy antiquity, have passed from country to country, from language to language, borrowed, stolen, transmitted in all manner of ways, enriching one body of literature after another, and perpetually scattering seeds as they have blossomed and ripened on a fresh soil! And as gifted minds occasionally break forth, having the power of bringing up, from the eternal mines of truth, original ideas, — untried ores, and gems in the matrix, — how beautiful is it to see these mental treasures mingling gradually with the literary currency of one country after another, till they are the property of the whole civilized world!

The causes, which, under the guidance of a divine agency, contribute to these results, are as various as they are wonderful. A solitary scholar travels into a distant land, impelled by a curiosity not planted in all hearts; he has less of *inhabitiveness*, perhaps, than other men; he returns like the laden bee to his hive. The chances of war plunge another wise man into bondage beneath a foreign sky; the collar is on his neck, but the free mind works, and the exile teaches to his master's children the lore of his own unforgotten home. The plumed warrior leads his host into some venerable land, where the desert wind sweeps the sand over monuments that defy Time, the destroyer, and the low voice of Tradition, and even its uncertain echoes, are nearly hushed; he marches in the selfish glory of military conquest; but from that land of silence, desolation, and seeming oblivion, he brings back, with more vulgar booty, the scholar's food; some dim memorials of dead nations, languages, and religions, from which patient ingenuity may wring out knowledge. Now the victor carries civilization into the peak-roofed huts of the Gaul and Briton; and now the barbarian from his vast forests, rushes howling into the splendid abodes of decrepit civilization, to be taught by a subdued people. The light of learning, that once blazed from the plains of Hindostan and the excavated temples of Ellora, amid a people utterly passed away, utterly forgotten even to namelessness, moves majestically westward and illumines the mysterious waters of the Nile; next it gleams placidly among the groves of Academus, and in the fair columns of the Parthenon; then glides to a younger altar, amid the seven hills of the Eternal City, and tinged with many hues caught from various skies, it burns on with a prismatic radiance of mingled histories and mythologies. It cannot be quenched by a tempest from the North; it grows

dim, flickers, and dies down under the strange, long night of the Dark Ages, but is not extinguished. Its indestructible embers lurk in quiet monasteries, fanned by a few humble individuals, unconscious of their own solemn instrumentality ; it has kindled other lights, far apart from each other, beside the throne of the heathen Saracen, and amid the snows and volcanoes of lonely Christian Iceland. And when again the shadows withdraw from Europe, how broad becomes the blaze of mental illumination ! Every scattered spark kindles its flame, and in how many countries is there light at last ! Then the white sails of Commerce are seen studding all the seas of the round globe, and they waft homeward not only the conveniencies and luxuries which artificial man demands, but to the student, the philosopher, the poet, fresh materials for that invisible laborer, Mind. In this oft-told tale, who does not mark the All-powerful, caring for the intellect with which He has informed these tenements of clay ?

At the present day, it is difficult to bear in mind how necessarily the literature of an isolated country, depending only on its own resources, must be meagre and deficient in variety. But who that has perused the relics of Gaelic poetry can help perceiving the fact ? Who that compares the *Iliad* with the *Paradise Lost*, can avoid seeing the immense advantages of the learned English poet of the seventeenth century over the bards of ancient Greece ? From how many countries, arts, histories, mythologies, is drawn the glorious imagery of that epic, which is England's boast. Here, indeed, we find the wealth of "*Ormus and of Ind*," mingling with tribute from the sacred page, from classic antiquity, from the old traditions of Armorica and Cornwall, the records of later chivalry, the literature of awakened Italy, from the sciences, all dissolved together in the crucible of his own glowing poetic mind, and poured forth in a golden stream along the immortal page. The spirits of the prophets and poets of Judea, of Homer and Virgil, of Dante and Ariosto, of Chaucer and Spenser, hovered in their mantles of inspiration around the sightless old man and breathed upon him — called up by the spells of those patient studies, in which his diligent and unspotted youth had been spent.

To him, therefore, whose object it is to invigorate and carry forward the intellect of his country, we would say, drink from every pure fountain, to which you can gain access. Thence

will be derived a freedom from absurd conventional rules and national prejudices, a knowledge of human nature as modified by different climates and governments, a fertility of allusion and variety of illustration, which will impart unexpected power. Such an one will be far less likely to repeat oracularly old truths in the vain conceit that they are new ; and will escape the mannerism of him who has learned all in a single school. How great an improvement has been obvious in American literature, since our scholars have begun to travel abroad, or study faithfully the writings of France, Italy, and Germany at home. But as there are many who have taste and leisure for literary pursuits, but not for the study of languages, the labors of the translator rise into no small importance. The different degrees of facility with which individuals acquire languages is remarkable, and should be taken into consideration in the direction we give our studies ; and those on whom the inconveniencies of the builder at Babel seem partially to rest, in an inability to comprehend more than one tongue, should beware of persevering in tasks, which involve much expense of time on a disproportionate object. Time, — a treasure incessantly slipping from the firmest grasp, — and the powers of the human mind, are both too precious to be so wasted ; and, if we may quote so unfashionable an authority as Locke, “ Labor for labor’s sake is against nature.” There are many, whose hours may be better employed with the pen, or in other studies, than in poring over dictionaries and grammars ; yet who may eagerly and profitably seek acquaintance with the distinguished writers of other countries, and to them he is a benefactor indeed, who renders the impassable barrier transparent.

We are anxious to recommend the office of the translator to our countrymen, and countrywomen, because we think it might be here pursued with great usefulness ; not forgetting how much has already been done in this walk both wisely and well. In the records of the old world, we find that some of the greatest minds have not disdained to give their strength to it. The philanthropic and sagacious monarch, who was the phenomenon of the ninth century, having the good of his Anglo-Saxon subjects at heart, gave them the benefit of his studies by translations from the Latin into their own rude, half-formed dialect ; one of the very first who is recorded to have performed for them this humble, but substantial service, fraught with more consequences than we can now pause to enumerate. It is a

quiet, unobtrusive way of aiding our fellow-creatures ; it does not bring the great Me out of the background. The translator may have the honor of being criticised ; but he is very apt to find that his best labors are not appreciated ; and is seldom heralded before the world by a flourish of trumpets. The love of fame can have little to do with his exertions ; the love of money may ; but as we look back on the short career of our country, we have faith in higher and purer motives.

The Poem, whose title stands at the head of this article, was not translated by an American pen ; but it is the first production of the Swedish muse, which has fallen in our way, and had for us the charm of a literary curiosity. Well acquainted with the useful but unromantic exports of the Baltic shores, with the ship-loads of timber, pitch, iron, potash, and herrings, that, issuing from the jaws of the sweetly named Cattegat and Skaggerack, seek a thousand ports, we have not been in the habit of finding among these precious commodities the intellectual recreation of a leisure hour. The history of Sweden has formed but a small part of the usual course of historical studies in this country. The patriotism of Gustavus Vasa, the insane courage of Charles the Twelfth, the mingled excellencies of Gustavus Adolphus, and the vicious follies of his unworthy daughter, stand out in bold relief on the uninteresting annals of her sovereigns. To many the name of Linnæus represents her men of science in solitary dignity ; while that of Emanuel Swedenborg, with mysterious and disputed ray, gleams before others, lonely as the meteor on an unknown heath. Few interesting volumes of travels in these sequestered regions have reached us ; and we doubt not that many of our readers will be as much surprised at encountering a highly poetical effusion from a Swedish mind, as if in coursing over the wastes of snowy Lapland at the heels of a rein-deer, they had dashed through a thicket of moss-roses in full bloom. Yet the Germans, somewhat nearer to the lands that once were Scandinavia than ourselves, would tell us that we commit the usual errors of youth, and betray our own ignorance and presumption in thus undervaluing old Sweden. In 1818, she published three hundred and sixty-two works, of which only ninety-one were translations. The wild scenery of her mountainous peninsula, presenting spectacles of Alpine magnificence, especially in its Norwegian recesses, (which of late have tempted the tourists of England in their summer yachts,) the stirring romance of her early legends, cannot but

have favored the development of imagination among her literary men. How can they help listening to the

“Voice of the gifted elder time,
Voice of the charm and Runic rhyme,”

to the thousand poetical voices, heard on their sea-worn shores, in their forests of rocking pines and firs, from their rustling midnight skies, when

“the Heavens are bright
With the arrowy streams of the northern light.”

Sweden has come, like a corps de reserve, late, but full of vigor, into the literary arena of Europe. The spirit of her people has ever been a strong one. Remote from the throne of the Cæsars, in the happy obscurity of a Terra Incognita, she never beheld the brazen helmets of Roman legions gleaming among her forests. She retained her own fierce form of Paganism till the tenth century. Christianity came at last, but not introduced by southern masters. The nation of warriors, where every husbandman kept his weapons bright, had been taught to consider courage as the first of virtues, and was predisposed to look on a religion of peace with contempt. Wrapped in storms, the gloomy gods of Scandinavia gave way slowly; but the “hammer of Thor” dropped at last, and the buckler of Odin dissolved away under the soft, silvery light, which pursued them through a land of mountains, precipices, and forests, down the steep declivities which terminate in the desolate Frozen Ocean. Then peaceful monasteries arose. The temples of the deified wanderer, the second Odin, who, in some misty, half-fabulous age, had brought his migratory hordes from the shores of the Black Sea, or Caspian, (none knew certainly by what cause driven,) went to decay. His Runic characters, the rites of his superstition, bearing traces of their eastern origin, and his code of laws, once miracles of wisdom, were not hastily forgotten, but fell into neglect. Skokloster, pouring forth the matins and vespers of its holy men, rose on the margin of the same lake which reflected the ruins of old Sigtuna, once the chosen abode of throned Idolatry. But as centuries rolled on, bringing, like the floods, changes on all over which they passed, Protestantism drove out the studious recluses from their cells; still the intellect of a free people was at work. The universities of Sweden were her just pride. Upsala, more an-

cient than Stockholm herself, may now have her rivals ; but her past glories and present rich possessions may still be a nation's boast ; and the traveller, who would seek Marathon or Jena, may well visit her venerable cathedral, where under one quiet roof sleep the ashes of the patriotic Gustavus Vasa, and the learned, simple-hearted Linnæus. And in the history of Sweden there is one fact, which to every right mind should invest her with peculiar interest, for we believe the like of it has not been found in the annals of any other nation whatever. In the days of Gustavus Adolphus and Benstiern, she was ruled not only by a wise and virtuous prince, but he in his turn was blessed by the counsels of a minister as wise and virtuous as himself. Two such men not only lived in the same age, but at the same court, sprung from the same people, and studying its best interests, with apparently but one mind and heart between them. To read their biographies from the eloquent pen of James, after poring over those wearying chronicles of crime called History, is like turning from the dreadful splendors of a volcano to gaze at the peaceful stars gleaming on the opposite horizon. Cut off by the rude waves of the Baltic from the rest of the civilized world, Sweden has not been sleeping away her long seclusion. From time to time her strong independent mind has made itself felt in the politics of Europe, and given indications that it would yet show its power in the more refined "gymnastics of the intellect."

Esaias Tegner, the author of *Frithiof's Saga*, is a celebrated living poet of Sweden. He was born in 1782 ; wears the appropriate title of Knight of the North Star ; was appointed Greek professor at the university of Lund, in the south of Sweden, in 1812, and bishop of Wexiæ in 1824. He is the author of several poems ; but the one before us seems to have been the most popular. It was published at Stockholm in 1825, and in six years went through five editions. It was translated into the Danish soon after its publication, and three times received the same honor in Germany before it appeared in an English dress. In 1835 it was published in London, and, as we understand from the modest preface, more than one hand assisted in the translation. What was its reception there, we do not know. But we hold that it is a legitimate source of interest respecting any work to know that it is highly popular somewhere. We are tempted to ascertain, if we can, what qualities have made it popular, and, perhaps, thence draw our

inferences respecting the state of society in which its celebrity has been gained.

We confess that our own interest in this poem has been derived rather from the glimpses it affords us into the actual operation of that religious system, which was once so wide spread in all the north of Europe, than from its intrinsic poetical merit, or its nationality. Strongly marked, however, in these latter respects, it has seemed to us worthy the attention of our readers. It resembles rather the productions of the English mind, than those of the Germans, Italians, French, or Spanish. The languages of England and Sweden are well known to bear a strong affinity to each other; in some of the islands at the mouth of the Gulf of Bothnia, where the old Swedish tongue is spoken in its greatest purity, Dr. Clarke tells us his English servant was sometimes able to converse with the natives. Still the merits and demerits of *Frithiof's Saga* are of a different stamp from those of the other literatures of Europe, and it ought not, perhaps, to be judged by the standard of English taste.

Its hero, *Frithiof*, is a Swedish youth, and it is founded on legends of the eighth and ninth centuries, the epoch of those bloody piracies which once invested the Northern seas with terrors beyond those of their native storms, and swept with a besom of destruction the coasts of France and Britain. The author has thrown himself back into those rude ages with power, and, as it seems to us, with singular success. The supernatural agency introduced is, of course, that of the gods and goddesses worshipped in ancient Norway and Sweden; and the allusions to these fearful beings, their attributes and influence, are not so numerous as to confuse and disgust a foreign reader; but rather, in our opinion, serve to give a peculiar value to his imagery and interest to his simple plot.

The poem opens with a picture of two beautiful children, *Frithiof* and *Ingeborg*, growing up under the rustic roof of *Hilding*, their foster-father, an old Swedish peasant. *Ingeborg* is the king's daughter; the father of *Frithiof* is a rich landed proprietor, neither of royal nor noble descent, yet the dear friend and brother-in-arms of his sovereign. The simple habits of the era are thus brought vividly before us at once. But when the gentle princess, — suffered to blossom forth in retirement like a wild flower on a wooded hill-side, — very naturally returns the attachment of her brave young companion, we find from the warnings of the sagacious foster-father, that royal ladies might

not, even in those primitive times, hope to make matches of affection. He reminds the youth that

“ Her race ascends to Odin’s throne,”

and that his love is presumptuous and vain. His admonition is received as is customary on such occasions. He is answered by a flash of that fearless spirit, which characterizes the hero throughout the poem.

The second canto presents us with the father of Ingeborg, the venerable King Bele, leaning on his sword in the council-hall, and by his side Thorsten Vikingson, “that bondé brave and good,” the father of Frithiof. The monarch has summoned his own two sons, and the son of his friend, to hear his last counsels; for an hundred summers have whitened his hair and beard, and he has received tokens of his approaching departure.

“ And even as King Bele speaks, the hall-doors wide unfold ;
First Helge comes ! how dark his eye ! his bearing fierce and bold !

His joy is priestly craft alone, he loves the victim’s cries ;
And lo ! upon his hand still reeks the blood of sacrifice.

“ Next Halfdan comes, a blooming boy, with skin so dazzling fair,
But too effeminate his form, too curled his golden hair ;
His sword in a rich girdle hangs, as if alone for play,
And like a youthful maid he seems, so smiling, soft, and gay.

“ Last of the three young Frithiof came, wrapped in his mantle blue,
His height the other two surpassed, more firm his step and true,
Between the brothers there he stood, with proud, majestic mien,
As still between the morn and eve the brighter day is seen.”

The old men bestow their advice on the three youths ; it is full of wisdom, clothed in poetic language. In the third canto, we find them both laid peacefully in their graves, “beside the sea-beat shore ;” for this was the Age of Hills, when many a lofty green mound rose over the bones of departed warriors. The two princes together occupy the throne of their father, a practice which modern prudence has discarded ; and Frithiof, an only son, takes possession of the broad fields of the deceased bondé, (or cultivator,) with its flocks and herds, the proud mansion built of oak and fir, with its hall that could contain five hundred guests, and its stables with twice twelve steeds,

“Fiery and wild, like fettered winds, that strive to break their bound ;
Their hoofs are steel, red ribands deck their manes ; how shrill their neigh !
While from the lofty rack they tear and champ the fragrant hay.”

Stranger goods than these does Frithiof find at his hereditary domains of Framnaes ; a sword, framed by gnomes in a lofty land “at the portal of the Sun,” engraved with magic runes or characters, which no man in the North could understand, and called the “lightning’s brother ;” for the Scandinavians, like the Orientals, from whom they descended, gave most expressive names to their horses, dogs, and weapons. There was a warrior’s golden bracelet, too, which Thorsten Vikingson had won in actual struggle with a spectre, a species of conflict which was regarded with peculiar awe, as well it might be ; and lastly, a half-living ship, obedient to word of mouth as a trained elephant, with “black sails bound with scarlet.” In the long histories of these rarities, we have faithful sketches of the superstitions and manners of those remote times. They are full of imagination ; but it is not altogether the imagination of Tegner. He has taken what he found, but he has used his materials well. Even the bark *Ellide* embellishes Icelandic fable ; it is not quite so extravagant a fiction as that of the ship of Freyr, which could contain the whole tribe of the armed Asas, yet might be folded up and carried about like a handkerchief. The modern Swede has shown much discretion in the adoption of his machinery, availing himself of the picturesque legends of the Norzemen, and generally rejecting absurdities unendurable by the taste of the present day.

We must remember, as we read, that even now, in the long evenings of a Northern winter, by the blazing pine fire, these wild traditions from a Pagan age are told among the peasantry of Norway and Sweden, and form the staple of superstitions current among the vulgar. Nay, carried by the Saxons, and Danes, — under which name all the Northern piratical nations were known, — into Britain, they lingered for centuries after the religion which gave them birth had vanished. Gradually fading, they left traces on the very language which we, on this remote shore, now employ ; their shadows still flickered in the wild nursery tales, which, though pruned or mingled with more gorgeous fictions of southern birth, were listened to by the cu-

rious and credulous ear of childhood, both in old England and our own land, until the modern enchantress, Edgeworth, raised her wand, and banished giant, dwarf, and fairy together in "rabble rout." May she never in her turn be exorcised from a wholesome potency over young minds; though we cannot have the heart to drive Gammer Grethel too far from the circle.

We shall not proceed with the poem canto by canto; but will merely commend the plan adopted by the translators, of rendering each canto in a different metre. The effect is an agreeable variety; and we have occasionally much beauty of adaptation in the measure to the subject.

Frithiof, rousing himself from a dream of love, repairs to a council held by the young sovereigns at the tomb of King Bele, and before the assembled people demands the hand of Ingeborg. The proud Helge refuses the alliance in no courteous terms; and Frithiof, answering with equal haughtiness, insults the king by cleaving in twain his golden shield, which hangs on a neighboring tree, and rushes in fury to his ship.

We are next transported into Norway, where another venerable sovereign, adored by his people for his virtues, but dim-sighted and gray with years, announces amid his scalds and warriors his intention of demanding for his second bride the young daughter, whom King Bele had left. The ambassadors arrive before Helge, who, passionately devoted to the superstitions inculcated by the priesthood, and himself addicted to the performance of those priestly offices we should deem most uninviting, immediately betakes himself to the grove of sacrifice, slays his steed and falcon, but can find no good omen, and draw no response from priest or Vala, as the northern sybil was termed. The messengers of King Ring are dismissed with a rejection of their suit; and the thoughtless Halfdan, who seems to leave the cares of government to his gloomy brother, gaily anticipates the coming war. And war is made forthwith by the rejected monarch; a proceeding quite natural in those times, and to be expected even from one whose name has descended to posterity renowned for wisdom and goodness. And posterity has no right to wonder or blame, till wars cease to be made in causes as unjust and trivial.

Frithiof is found playing at chess with his foster-brother, Biorne, by the old man Hilding, who urges him to fly to the assistance of his youthful sovereigns, in the unequal conflict

which threatens them. The terms of the game are employed throughout this canto in a series of equivoques, which seem to us in bad taste; yet, through all this playing on words, we gather that the young hero's sullen determination is inflexible. But we soon find him holding an interview with Ingeborg, within the precincts of a temple, where she had been placed by her brother for protection. It is the temple of the golden-haired Balder, the Apollo of Northern mythology, the god of eloquence. Innocent as is the love of the young couple, such an interview in such a sacred spot is a sin in the superstitious belief of the times, and Ingeborg trembles while she listens to the accents of her lover. There is a passage here which betrays too plainly that the Swedish poet is not unacquainted with the tender parting of Romeo and Juliet.

“Hark! 't is the lark! no! 't is the dove,
I know that plaintive murmur still;
The lark still sleeps beside his love
In his warm nest on yonder hill.

“But see! that light! no! 't is not day;
'T is but the bale-fire in the east.”

The lovers separate; but we next find Ingeborg awaiting the return of Frithiof from a royal council, to which, under the softening influence of his last interview with her, he had once more repaired. All night had she waited to learn her fate from his lips, and during those weary hours of suspense, many a bitter thought had passed through her pure mind. To her timid eyes the awful countenance of the statue had seemed to frown upon their interview, through the shades of the preceding night; she trembles in the consciousness of having offended a benevolent deity; and in the sincerity of her penitence, she determines that if her brother be inexorable still, she will sacrifice her happiness to duty. Scarcely has this high resolve been formed, when Frithiof returns, his dark eye and pale cheek announcing their doom ere he speaks. He had so far mastered his own proud spirit as again to demand the hand of Ingeborg from Helge, offering him at the same time his assistance in the approaching contest with King Ring. Helge, without deigning to turn on him his stern forbidding eye, had declared that the maid might be given to the son of a bondé, but never to the man who dared profane the temple of Balder; and demanded a direct answer to the question, whether he had not there held an in-

terview with Ingeborg. The youth fearlessly acknowledges the truth, and is interrupted by wild cries from the throng around, once his zealous admirers; those near him start back as if they had seen a plague spot on his brow, and the triumphant Helge pronounces instant sentence. He commands the indignant culprit to sail forthwith for a distant isle in the west, there to collect the tribute which its fierce yarl or earl had been accustomed to pay to King Bele, but which had been discontinued since that sovereign's decease.

It is with these tidings that Frithiof returns to Ingeborg; and then with impetuosity urges her flight with him. Carrying with them a handful of earth from the graves of their dead fathers, — a beautiful touch of filial piety in his fiery character, — he proposes that they should seek the placid seas and beautiful isles of Greece, which he had heard described by his parent, and there lead a life of unearthly felicity. There is great poetical beauty in the sketch of these unseen lovely climes from the lips of the young Norzeman; and beauty of a still higher kind in the firmness with which Ingeborg resists his intreaties. She considers herself bound to regard her brother as clothed with all the rights of her deceased father. But the cruel struggle between this rigid sense of duty, and an attachment which had grown up innocently from childhood in her heart, is obvious; and when the lover, incensed that even she should thwart his schemes of happiness, bids her an angry adieu, the whole tenderness of her nature breaks out with a simple and touching pathos. His resentment is at once quenched by her tears; and finding the heroic girl not to be moved from her upright purpose, he parts from her with attachment strengthened tenfold, as it ever must be in such cases, by reverence for her conscientiousness; valuing her love far more because he finds she is not the mere creature of impulse, like himself, but that dignified, half-divine being, a woman of principle, one who asks but "what is right?" and does it, cost what it may.

We then have Ingeborg's Lament, which disappointed us; perhaps only because the feelings having just been highly wrought, no uttered lament could affect us so powerfully as an image left in our minds of resigned, hopeless, silent sorrow. The next canto, called "*Frithiof at Sea*," is full of the wildness of legendary lore. Helge, by his incantations on the beach, summons the demons of Arctic tempests to pursue the hated lover of his sister. The storm is described in spirited verses,

perpetually varying in measure. At last, Frithiof, suspecting fiendish interference with his voyage, looks from the mast-head.

“But what strikes his vision, thus swimming so fast?
Lo! a whale, like an island broke loose, rushes past!
Upon its broad back two fell demons are seen,
While still o’er the whale dash those billows of green.
Heid bears the rude shape of a monstrous ice-bear,
He shakes snows around while his eye-balls fierce glare;
And Ham there appears in a huge eagle’s form,
He flaps his vast wings, and more rough blows the storm.”

Frithiof instantly gives orders, — not to his crew, — but to his ship!

“If thou art Agir’s child,
With thy keel sharp and true,
Cut me that whale in two!”

Ellide obeys; Frithiof pierces the sinking fiends with his arrows; the storm is lulled; ship and billows, mountain and sky, smile beneath the “broad golden eye of the sun,” and an island of massy rocks and green hillocks appears before him. We are sorry that our poet describes his hero as bearing to the shore *eight* of his exhausted seamen at once! Barbarous nations prize bone and muscle not a little, and with good cause; the heroes of fable are always semi-giants; but we can hardly forgive our modern bard for presenting such an undignified and grotesque image as an illustration of Frithiof’s physical efficiency.

For the sake of his brave father Thorsten, an old friend of the yarl, Frithiof is treated with much honor by the chieftain in his “silver helmet” and ample mantle,

“With richest stars embroider’d bright;
Of purple velvet was the ground,
The lining was of ermine white.”

After wintering with Angantyr, our young warrior receives from him a purse of gold, not as tribute to the sons of Bele, but as a mark of personal regard for himself; and sails on his return under the blue skies of spring. The description of his approach to the familiar shore is fine, but too long for quotation. He beholds the dome of Balder’s temple with emotion, and his falcon comes flying from its roof to settle on his arm. But

when he doubles the rocky point, and looks for his own mansion, on the well known height stands only a "dark and murky pile." He lands to gaze upon a scene of desolation. His dog bounds upon his breast, and his milk-white steed gallops toward him,

"And seeks as whilome in his hand for food ;"

but neither wall nor roof is to be seen in all his once fertile domain ; the winds still sport with the ashes of his home. The silver-haired Hilding comes slowly forward to explain the dreary mystery. King Ring had fought a battle with the Swedish princes, in which the gay Hafsdan had distinguished himself by his bravery ; but the Norwegian had conquered ; and as King Helge in his flight had passed Framnaes, he had wantonly and malignantly fired the residence of the absent Frithiof. Then, to secure peace, he had yielded his sister, and Ingeborg had been borne away, the bride of the veteran Ring.

Frithiof forgets for a moment his wrongs at the hand of Helge, in his indignation at Ingeborg ; but the old man paints to him the holy submission and deep wo with which, to save her country, she had given herself as a victim at the altar ; and the brutality with which, even at that solemn hour, Helge had torn from her arm a bracelet, the parting gift of Frithiof, and placed it on the statue of Balder. The feelings of the impetuous youth rush into another channel. The next canto, commencing,

"The midnight sun on the mountain rests,
Its disk of a bloody hue ;
It is not night, it is not day,
But something between the two,"

is one of the most spirited in the poem. Frithiof bursts

"With his soul on fire,
And speech like an autumn storm,"

upon the rites which Helge is celebrating in the temple of Balder ; dashes the purse of gold into the king's face and fells him to the ground, threatens the priests,

"Those wan old men with their silver beards,
And knives in their bloody hands,"

and in attempting to tear the bracelet from the arm of the idol,

brings down the vast statue upon the blazing altar. It burns; the flames are communicated to the temple, and Frithiof vainly strives to check the sacrilegious conflagration.

“Frithiof, on high, like the rain-god drenched,
In the midst of the danger stands,
And stern in the face of the growing death,
He issues his calm commands.”

But the morning wind blows strong from the north, and the destruction is complete.

“On, on through the grove the fire surge rolls,
No limits its waves can bound!
The sun is up! still the red abyss
Throws its awful glare around.”

“Desolation reigns, and Frithiof turns
With horror and grief away.”

In this revulsion of feeling, he gazes from his ship on the smoking ruins of the temple, and bitterly muses on his fate. What has he now to hope from gods or men? Desperate are his prospects, and desperate the course he embraces. He resolves to forswear the land, and henceforth live a life of violence upon the ocean; to become one of the vikings, seakings, or pirates, whose exploits in those times were thought deeds of glory, and especially smiled upon by the gods themselves!

Tegner adheres to historical probability, in thus sending forth his young hero to forget his blighted hopes in the excitements of a corsair-existence, amid scenes of blood and rapine. The younger sons of Scandinavian princes often had but a pitch-black ship and a fearless crew, instead of a portion of their patrimony; and were thought as well disposed of as the cadets of a noble English family at present, when placed in the army or navy. The causes of the sudden appearance of these pirates on the English and French coasts are inexplicable; and according to an able historian, only to be sought in the ancient traditions of Scandinavia. On the mountains of romantic Norway and wild Sweden grew those mighty trunks, which still supply the finest navies of the world with masts that scorn the tempest; and to the surrounding ocean all men, unblessed with wealth and impatient of labor on a hard soil, betook themselves. Under the influence of their bloody false gods, few were the

peaceful dwellers on hill or plain ; the land was sparsely peopled, while ocean swarmed with the "nailed ships" of the sons of Odin. The restless, the ambitious, the disappointed, rushed upon the sea, exulting in the skill which to them rendered mists and storms a friendly shelter, and revelling in the plunder which they tore without compunction, not only from the then slender commerce of nations, but from the quiet fertile fields of the English or French husbandman. Nay, the mighty Charlemagne wept as he beheld their ill-omened vessels sweeping up the Mediterranean, and the fair coasts of Greece did not escape their ravages.

We must pass unnoticed Frithiof's *Apostrophe* to the broad, unfettered Sea, to his Father's Tomb, his Farewell to the North, and his Code of Regulations for his Warriors. The poet has here embodied in a few stanzas the fierce laws, by which the Scandinavian bands of corsairs were held in bloody cohesion ; for true is it, that no form of society can be utterly lawless.

The reckless youth wanders over the deep, winning much gold, which he despises, and a horrid fame, which cannot make him happy. He looks on the marble temples of Greece, and remembers Ingeborg, whom he had vainly wooed to these sunny realms ; he pines for the bleak hills of the North, thinks of the tree he had planted on his father's grave, and at last, finding no relief from his wretchedness in this fearful species of exile, with the vane at his mast-head blowing towards the north, he again cuts through the German ocean. In disguise he visits the court of King Ring, to look once more on his lost one ; she recognises him, and

"Swift on Ingeborg's cheek the roses come and go,

Changing its hue like northern light reflected on the snow."

In spite of the warnings of Frithiof, Ring sets forth with his young queen in a sledge upon the frozen lake ; the ice bursts, and Frithiof, who is beside them, "steel-shod," rescues both from a watery grave. He afterwards accompanies the monarch in the chase, and resists a terrible, tempting opportunity to slay his aged rival, which is very poetically told. King Ring knows the young man's trial, but his words of approbation cannot cheer the withered heart. Still, conscience-stung and restless, Frithiof resolves to seek the ocean once more, and there perish ; when lo ! King Ring, scorning to die of mere old age, and bent on following "his great forefathers' law," calls for a sword, and

deliberately cutting his veins to Odin, bequeathing his queen to Frithiof, and his kingdom, too, in trust for his infant son, — dies triumphantly and opportunely. This seems to us an abrupt and shocking way of extricating a hero from his perplexities; though the “*nodus*” is assuredly “*dignus vindice*,” but our poet is borne out by the spirit of the times when King Ring flourished. It is well known that many a Scandinavian warrior so fell, who found himself in danger of dying ignobly “on straw.”

The “*Ting*,” or national council, is held in the open air, to which the peasantry flock, armed; they choose the boy for their future king, bidding Frithiof marry the widowed Ingeborg, and rule till the child is of age. Frithiof dares not obey till he has consulted the *Nornas*, or Fates. His unenlightened conscience pursues him with reproaches, not for his piratical career, but for the frantic and partly accidental act of violence which had laid a temple in ashes; so false are the distinctions between vice and virtue in the heart of the heathen.

He hastens to the green mound where his father lies buried, and there in sight of the ruined fane, pours forth his heartfelt contrition till sunset, when, floating over the western wave,

“A vision draweth near of mingled fire and gold.”

It assumes the form of a gorgeous temple, and descends upon the site of the blackened shrine;

“And see! where leaning on their shields they pause,
The solemn *Nornas* at the temple’s base,
Like three fair roses in a single vase,
A serious beauty beaming from each face.”

Frithiof comprehends the vision, and rejoices in the hope, that by deeds of peace he may atone for youthful crimes. His first act of power is to rebuild the temple with splendor; and at its dedication the High Priest delivers to him an exhortation, containing much of the doctrines of that remarkable compilation, the *Edda*. After a beautiful allusion to the approaching religion of Christ, whose tomb, he says, lies “under distant palm-trees,” but the fame of whose peaceful doctrines has reached him, he boldly rebukes the proud, wrathful, and vengeful spirit of Frithiof. He tells him that to little purpose hath he rebuilt the temple, unless he make expiation within his own breast, by sacrificing all anger and hatred. Then announcing the death

of Helge, he bids the penitent reconcile himself with Halldan, who enters through the gate of bronze, hesitating and silent. The hero promptly obeys ; the ban which had hung over him is dissolved ; Ingeborg suddenly advances in bridal array, and their hands are joined in the glittering, newly-consecrated temple.

That Tegner is a man of genius none can doubt, who read "Frithiof's Saga," even through the medium of a translation. Of the accuracy of the translation we have no means of judging. But if we admire the glowing imagination of the poet, pouring forth a redundancy of images and illustrations like a fountain of fire, coruscating like the *Aurora Borealis* of his native skies, still deeper homage do we pay to his fine moral sense, which has portrayed a character so exalted as that of Ingeborg. The narrative is beautifully pure ; the contrasts of character well managed ; that between the brothers Helge and Halldan, though the latter be only an outline, is distinct ; and that between Frithiof and Ingeborg, both true to nature and well sustained. Her gentleness, her integrity, her tenderness of conscience, — that loveliest trait of innocence, — and her firmness of purpose, are so mingled with a womanly strength of affection, as to raise her far above the ordinary standard of heroines. Indeed, a common-place poet or novelist would have disposed of her very differently ; and instead of wedding her to King Ring, would have striven to interest us by her sufferings in a mad flight with her lover ; or would have bidden us weep over the fair and youthful self-murderess. Tegner has painted one who can rule herself, despising the romantic and dangerous sentiment, on which so many bewitching fictions have been based, so much real usefulness and happiness wrecked. Frithiof, on the other hand, stands forth, the wild and fiery child of impulse ; headstrong and headlong, he listens only to the first hasty promptings from within ; and well has Tegner painted the ever recurring regrets, the outward violence, the inward restlessness and misery of such a being. We think, therefore, that this poem has a moral, and a fine one. If there be an anachronism in the production, it is the pervading one of carrying on the action in a pagan land, with pagan agents, yet allowing the whole poem to breathe a Christian spirit, a Christian moral. But we cannot quarrel with our author for this ; our hearts tell us he has done right. And he may, indeed, plead that he has carefully abstained from representing Frithiof as

enduring remorse on account of his piracies ; that he has but followed tradition and legend, which assign to the women of the ancient North many exalted traits, (beautifully developed afterwards in the Anglo-Saxon princesses, who were the first Christian converts of their country,) and that he has borrowed most of his direct moral axioms from the Edda itself.

And now we part from him gratefully, musing over what the world was before Christianity came into it ; and what it would be should Christianity soar away, and leave it to its own lights of reason. Should the God-enkindled sun be quenched, what flame that mortal hand might light could supply its place ? He has set the distant stars in the firmament ; but would their rays give man sufficient light and heat ?

These thoughts are not so apt to be roused by the fables of classic mythology, because with their horrors and absurdities we have been familiar from youth ; they have ceased to startle. But, as we rose from this Swedish poem, in which, as we remarked before, is exemplified the actual operation of a religion, which sprang from man's own upward impulses, and grew up in his unaided soul, and which once ruled succeeding generations over many a wide country, our own remote ancestors, how pure, lovely, transcendent, and perfect seemed to us the doctrines of Jesus of Nazareth ! Who would dare risk the consequences of reverting to those days, of being thrown back upon the "instincts and intuitions" of his nature ? Who can endure that a single stone should be thrown at the faith which had the power to supersede superstitions, deep-seated as they were horrible, and to teach men to conquer their passions instead of deifying them, when no competent substitute is offered ? And who can help fearing that if the religion of all enlightened men could possibly become Pantheism, monstrous Polytheism would inevitably be that of the ignorant and less intellectual ?

L. J. P.

ART. V. — *Eighth Annual Report of the Trustees of the Perkins Institution and Massachusetts Asylum for the Blind, to the Corporation.* Boston : John H. Eastburn. 1840.

THIS pamphlet, though of an unpretending size and form, contains matter interesting and useful to the philanthropist and the philosopher. It renders an account of sums placed in the hands of the Trustees of the Perkins Institution for the Instruction of the Blind, and briefly states some of the results which have followed the employment of these funds, bestowed by the generosity of private individuals, or the munificence of the state.

The art of introducing knowledge into minds, shut against its entrance by the privation of one or more of the senses, (those indispensable avenues to intelligence,) has a strong claim to our attention. To learn its method, to contemplate its results, cannot but be interesting to those, who have at heart the improvement and the happiness of their fellow-creatures. The records of this and similar institutions would unfold to us tales of thrilling interest, not surpassed by those of the novelist ; and histories of the pursuit of knowledge under difficulties, as astonishing and as replete with encouragement as any we now possess. Here we shall find cases in which the rational powers have been awakened, as it were, from a deep sleep, and the individual put in possession of all the independence and delight which accompany their exercise. Within that dull and listless exterior dwelt the spirit in its godlike power, formed to look back on the past, and gather up its wisdom, to pierce the future, and anticipate and accomplish its glorious results, endowed with the prerogative of investigating the secrets of nature, learning her laws, commanding her powers, performing her works ; but this spirit is imprisoned, its eye is closed, or its ear is dead. The heart is there, it throbs in that bosom with undefined desires, but it has no language to tell its emotions, it sees not the answering glow, it hears not the affectionate voice. These beings are neglected, except by the very few, on whom the ties of consanguinity or the laws of common benevolence impose the task of supplying their immediate wants. Fetters are on their souls, the bright world of knowledge and of love forever barred. The steps by which the spirit is released from bondage, re-

stored to its native functions, and filled with the ecstasy of thought, under the guidance of benevolence, and through its own earnest and healthful endeavors, are worthy to be traced in all their details ; and we wish that some graphic hand would present us with the picture.

Through what unwearied pains this work has been accomplished, we can only learn by visiting these asylums, now established in many of our cities for the blind and for the deaf, and witnessing the knowledge and the happiness which are their unfailing results. The vacant, restless manner, which reveals that most melancholy of wants, the want of occupation ; the discontented, cheerless condition of the dependent and the companionless, are banished from these abodes ; activity, sympathy, and progress, meet you at every step. The needy, beside the usual branches of a good school education, are taught some art, or trade, by which their independence is secured, and instead of being a burden, become useful members of the community.

“ The working department,” says the Report, “ has continued steadily in operation, and received additional patronage from the public.

“ It has paid its own expenses, including stock, and four hundred dollars wages to blind persons, [once pupils,] and the rent of a shop in Washington street. We do not include, however, in the expenses, the board of the pupils.

“ In this connexion, we may make some observations upon the prospective want of an establishment, connected with or supplementary to our own, which shall offer a home and an occupation to those who have finished their education.

“ There are very serious objections to having adult blind persons introduced promiscuously into an establishment destined for the education of children. The effects upon each class are bad, for reasons which will be obvious to any thinking person.

“ But it often happens that a laboring man is suddenly bereft of his sight by accident ; he is deprived of all means of support, and his situation is much more unhappy than that of one born blind. If all schools for the blind are closed to him, his only refuge is the alms-house.

“ Again, there are now in this country five institutions for the instruction of the blind. Every year there will be discharged from them a few individuals, some of whom cannot gain a livelihood by themselves, but might earn enough to pay for their own board, to clothe themselves, and to have a spare penny for the extra comforts of life. Take, for instance, the case of a young

man who is expert at making mattresses, a most excellent business, but requiring capital ; he can earn four or five dollars a week, at journeyman's wages ; but suppose he attempts to set up for himself, he must buy his materials at retail prices, he must sell his goods as soon as manufactured, for he cannot command his price by holding on through the autumn and winter for the spring trade, and in a short time he fails. We have known more than one such case.

"Considerations of this kind have made some friends of the blind desirous of founding a central establishment for the *Industrious Blind*, from various parts of the country. It should be an establishment to which any could be admitted, who could earn enough to pay their board and clothe themselves ; and where they could work by piece-work, and be paid at regular periods. They should be subjected to no more restrictions than were absolutely necessary for good order and correct morals ; and be left to pass their leisure hours as best suited them." — pp. 10 — 12.

The pursuit of knowledge under difficulties is a subject which, as we have already hinted, would here find abundant illustration. The difficulties cheerfully met and overcome by those, who are denied the natural facilities for learning, are not such as have usually obstructed the path of study to those gifted individuals, whose history has been preserved for our instruction. These difficulties have often whetted, rather than checked the desire of improvement, and are more than compensated by the superior natural endowments which prompt their possessor to enter on the course to usefulness and fame. It cannot frequently happen that these unfortunates possess superior powers of mind, and they labor under the disadvantage of being to a great extent destitute of that facility in the use of their faculties, which the incessant action of the senses calls out in infancy, whether the individual be subjected to any regular training, or not. Yet, so strong is the impulse to seek knowledge, and to indulge the social feelings, that incredible labor is encountered to satisfy these propensities. Those who have attended exhibitions at this Institution, or at our other asylums for the blind, or the deaf mutes, can testify to the wonder and admiration called forth on witnessing the progress made by the pupils, and the slow and difficult processes they go through in order to acquire the usual branches of education. What patience and toil it must require to attain to the use of written and oral language without the aid of speech, or to read with the fingers. We have seen a blind young gentleman perform in his head an algebraic

process, and give the result accurately, which, as we were told by the instructor, would if written out cover a surface of two feet square; he was also a good Latin and Greek scholar; and children of eight and ten years old answer any question put to them in geography, astronomy, and arithmetic, by feeling alone.

Some years ago, we attended one of the regular lessons in writing given to a class of deaf mutes at the Institution in Philadelphia. The teacher expressed by signs, (not the manual alphabet,) the sentence to be written. While doing this, the eyes of each scholar were rivetted on him; then turning instantly to their slates, each wrote the sentence in a plain good character. Some completed the task a little sooner than the others. One of the number (whose countenance evinced great sensibility) wrote it wrong. As soon as this was pointed out to her she burst into tears. The teacher, with much kindness of manner, informed her that she had mistaken him, and proposed to repeat the lesson, at which her face brightened up directly, and her attention became fixed. They all wrote again; she not only executed the task with perfect correctness, but completed it the first. A young girl next her, on observing this, embraced her with evident pleasure, clapping her hands for joy at the success of her companion, and turning round, pointed it out to the teacher. This little trait of generous sympathy, so beautifully pure and spontaneous, brought tears into the eyes of the spectators. What springs of feeling and intelligence had been unlocked in these young creatures, by the art of instructing deaf mutes, and what praise is due to those who have learned, and with so much patience engaged in the practice of this art, loosing by their efforts not the body, but the soul, from thralldom.

Another point deserving attention is the method of instruction adopted in these institutions. Necessity is the parent of invention. The peculiar difficulties attending the instruction of those to whom one or more of the natural entrances to knowledge is closed, have led their teachers to seek out the best methods. There is, in children possessed of all their senses, so many avenues to the mind from without, and such consequent activity of the faculties, roused, solicited, developed as they are by the events and objects of every moment of existence, that not even the poorest method of teaching, nor the least attractive topics, nor the chilling atmosphere of harsh-

ness, can entirely check their curiosity and aptitude to learn. Their activity and constant questioning, deemed so irksome by those who possess not the art to direct these propensities to their legitimate ends, secure to the young, though often through much tribulation, a competent amount of knowledge. Who that reflects on the fact, that a child, during the short period of two years, and that when its capacities are the weakest, makes the most elaborate of all our acquisitions, language, will doubt the teachableness of his nature?

But it is not so with the deaf or the blind; a death-like stillness reigns with one, eternal darkness and gloom with the other. Without some improvements on the common method of teaching, little success would be anticipated in any attempt to enlighten their minds. It needed only this conviction to lead to the discovery of a better method. By a careful study of the process of the mind in arranging and retaining its ideas, by distinguishing the circumstances which are favorable from those which are hindrances to the quickness and clearness of our perceptions, certain rules were evolved, and on application modified and perfected by experience. The peculiar difficulties of the case being clearly apprehended were met with patience and perseverance, on the part of both pupil and teacher; these sentiments being always reciprocated by the pupil, when manifest in the teacher. The admirable, it might almost be said miraculous, result of such earnest and harmonious coöperation have caused the heart of the spectator to leap for joy, as he witnessed in these bereaved ones the evidence of their clear possession and ready use of that rich treasure of thoughts and emotions, which are the birthright of Humanity. The following passage is from the annual report for 1839:—

“The system of education adopted at the commencement of the Institution has been followed during the past year, and with gratifying results. That system having been explained in previous Reports, we need only allude now to its general features. The moral, intellectual, and physical nature of the pupils is developed by a division of their time, and a variety in their occupations, which calls each into daily exercise. Four hours are devoted to intellectual pursuits, four hours to music, four to mechanical labor, four to recreation and play, and eight to sleep.

“With regard to intellectual education, our principle has been, that the mind has an appetite for knowledge, as the body has for food; and that the exercise of any of the mental faculties in the

acquisition of knowledge, is accompanied and rewarded by vivid pleasure. This pleasure nature has made so strong as to be a sufficient inducement to the exercise of the intellect: the child seeks knowledge for the gratification it brings; and the object of teaching should be, to present to each and all the mental faculties opportunities for action, and objects upon which to act, at the appropriate time. Every child finds delight in the exercise of his perceptive faculties, and never tires of learning new facts and new things. It is only when he is called upon to study words that he cannot understand, and to exercise powers of reasoning and abstraction, which are as yet undeveloped, that he turns from books and school to observe and learn for himself the things which nature presents to his senses.

"This principle, we have found, can be surely relied upon in our school; and trusting to it, we need none of the stimuli which are by some supposed necessary. We have no corporal punishments, no prizes, no taking precedence in classes, no degradations. Emulation there is, and will be; nature provides for this in the self-esteem of each individual; but this sentiment can rarely be cultivated and used in schools as an incentive, without producing envyings and heart-burnings.

"Acting upon this principle, and taking care to avoid fatigue, by giving the pupils short lessons and frequent recesses, our teachers succeed in imparting much knowledge to them. It is gratifying to find, that in spite of their having one avenue to the mind closed, they can advance in almost every branch of study about as fast as seeing children; and it is still more gratifying to witness the pleasure they derive from learning a new fact, or developing a new thought.

"The whole number who attend the school regularly is sixty. Of these, fifty-two can read the books in raised letters; ten boys, and fifteen girls can write a legible hand; all those above eight years of age are well grounded in the elementary studies of grammar, arithmetic, and geography; while some have made very respectable acquirements in the higher branches of natural philosophy, algebra, geometry, and astronomy." — pp. 3-5.

Let such as are disposed to complain of the dulness and forwardness of their pupils visit these institutions, and ascertain if they can, by what method it is, that learning is to their inmates rendered delightful, and that their progress sometimes outstrips that of children who have the use of all their senses. The general principles of instruction, as well as their details, are most worthy to be studied. Their efficacy proves their truth.

It will be seen that here moral and intellectual results are not

expected to flow from physical means. So far from there being a necessity of severity to induce the young to learn, it will here be found that kindness and encouragement are the atmosphere in which the faculties most readily expand. Owing to the very earnestness of the mind for knowledge, it is baffled and chilled when it is presented with a confused idea, and it never takes a firm step, till it knows the ground on which it stands, and is led from the idea it already has to the next, without fatigue or precipitation. The active powers of a child cannot be called forth, unless presented with objects suited to his taste and capacity, or connected with such as means to ends. Sympathy, too, that powerful agent in instruction, that sun to the darkened mind, is never withheld, and it invests every duty and labor with the attractions of the heart. An indispensable rule, and one never lost sight of in the instruction of the blind or deaf, is a clear comprehension of the first step, before the second is proposed. It often happens that one child fails to take an idea which others comprehend immediately. Let not the fault be laid on him, it belongs to the instructor, who was not careful to mark, that in this case the previous ideas were not yet introduced. This may be owing to dulness or inattention in the pupil, but till it is done, the lesson is in vain, and serves only to irritate both teacher and pupil. Dulness is a constitutional defect; it cannot be cured by scolding or whipping, though it is often confirmed by these. Inattention comes more within the province of the will, and the inquiry here should be, what will command attention? The old answer, the fear of punishment, or the hope of reward, is a very insufficient one; though it may bring immediate relief, like a drastic medicine, it leaves the patient more subject to the disease than ever. Nothing short of a desire to attain the object will permanently command attention, or ensure successful effort; and if this cannot be inspired by an exhibition of its beauty, or its value, by an appeal to the curiosity, sympathy, and emulation, it must be relinquished, and the pupil put on another course. Something there will certainly be which his heart is formed to desire, and his talents fitted to attain, and in this only will his progress be satisfactory to himself and others.

It will, we are persuaded, be found true, and the history of these institutions confirms the opinion, that the young will learn with readiness and pleasure, when suitable objects and necessary facilities for their attainment are presented

to them, and kindness, patience, and an adaptation of the mode of instruction to their natural endowments are perseveringly employed. An exact detail of the methods of instruction pursued in this and similar institutions, with the general principles on which they are founded, would be a valuable present to teachers. There is one thing more, as we were told by the principal of the asylum, not less indispensable than a right method, and that is a hearty interest in the work, on the part of the instructor. An earnest devotion of the mind to the object, which will call forth all his powers, enable him to seize the peculiarities of each mind under his charge, and which, where known methods fail, prompts to the invention of new ones. Such a concentration of the thoughts as only true interest can produce breathes, as it were, a new soul, and surprises even the possessor, by the reach of abilities of which he had hitherto remained unconscious. What is called a gift for teaching, will be found to consist in a great measure in this strong interest in the labor, which should always be one of love, and should never be undertaken, any more than that of the ministry, without the consciousness of being missioned. No doubt the peculiar misfortune of those children, who are deprived of one or more of the senses, awakens a more tender sympathy, and calls forth a greater degree of patience in the instructor, than can be expected in ordinary cases ; yet, reflection on the best methods of accomplishing his object, and a conscientious regard to duty, might enable a teacher (who had any heart) to enter into the feelings, compassionate the difficulties, and admire the awakening powers of his pupils ; for with the help of all their senses, in the present imperfect methods of teaching, and want of unction in the masters, learning is generally a hard and dull, if not distressing task, to these young creatures, whose path in the morning of life is not merely covered with dew-drops, which the buoyant step of infancy would easily brush away, but is strewn with unnecessary thorns.

There is still another view suggested by this report, on which we wish to dwell for a few moments ; and this is the aid furnished to the philosophy of mind by the observation and registering of the steps of its development under circumstances so peculiarly favorable for arriving at correct conclusions, as are here afforded.

That mankind have experienced the need of this philosophy, and been convinced of its possibility, is evident from the fact,

that every period and literature contain writings on the subject ; and some of the greatest geniuses of ancient and modern times have devoted their powers to the study of the human mind. What wonder, that in "glancing their eye from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven," they should select for contemplation the noblest and best of God's works. If, as is too true, we are still far from possessing anything having the certainty of science, this is to be ascribed not to any lack of interest or ability in the study, but to its intrinsic difficulties. Yet are we not discouraged by failure, but continue our endeavors to answer those deep questions, which the mind asks as earnestly and with as clear a consciousness of its right to ask them now, as it did ages ago.

Mental philosophy, like every other, must be founded on observation or reflection, which is internal observation ; all its admitted truths are inductions drawn from accurately observed facts. But the number of these truths, compared with the field they are required to cover, is very small, and the deficiency is supplied by ingenious theory. A too early generalization is the consequence, which, however it may have done some service in collecting and arranging facts, has been prejudicial in leading the student from the precise point of inquiry, and in the fabricating and distorting of instances. What we still want is facts, and facts which it is next to impossible to obtain.

The development of mind commences at the earliest period of life, and its operations are so varied and rapid, so unnoticed by the individual who experiences them, so imperfectly manifested to those around, that it would require the closest attention of a cautious and philosophic observer to obtain data which could be safely used. But who are the philosophers to whom this delicate task of science is confided ? Mothers and nurses, women, rarely well informed on any subject, except the immediate care of the body, deficient in habits of accuracy and generalization, and so far from possessing leisure for such nice investigations, immersed in petty cares and duties, vexatious and exhausting both to their minds and bodies. When philosophers attempt to trace the unfolding of the faculties, in order to arrive at the origin and analysis of our ideas, they labor under great disadvantages. The period of infancy, during which almost all ideas are acquired or developed, is to them a sealed book.

This report acquaints us with a very rare and favorable op-

portunity for observing the natural order of the unfolding of the faculties, in the case of Laura Bridgman, a little girl, now in the institution, who is deaf, dumb, and blind. We are informed that she was born with sight, but lost it at the age of eighteen months. During this time she was subject to severe disease, and it is not discoverable that she retains any traces of the impressions of that sense, though perhaps her mental powers may have been rather more developed, than if she had always been as destitute as she is at present. Since this early age she may be regarded as having but one sense. Smell is not perceptible, and taste is so faint as scarcely to furnish the occasion of any mental operation, except, simply the feeblest vapid impressions. Her intellect is uncommonly active, she has lively affections, and a very sweet temper. Her patience and industry would be extraordinary, in one possessed of the usual means of appreciating the value, and making the acquisition of knowledge; in one so bereft of these, they are nearly incredible.

“The account given in the Report of Laura Bridgman, though sufficiently minute for conveying an idea of her situation and acquirements, is not sufficiently so for those who regard her case as interesting and important in a psychological point of view.

“Such persons are assured that careful observations continue to be made, with a view to ascertaining the order of developments and the peculiar character of her intellectual faculties. The result will probably be made public; meantime, the following general observations, added to those in the last Reports, will serve to make out a general continuous history of the case.

“Having mastered the manual alphabet of the deaf mutes, and learned to spell readily the names of everything within her reach, she was then taught words expressive of positive qualities, as hardness, softness; and she readily learned to express the quality, by connecting the adjective hard or soft with the substantive; though she generally followed what one would suppose to be the natural order in the succession of ideas, placing the substantive first.

“It was found too difficult, however, then to make her understand any general expression of quality, as hardness, softness, in the abstract. Indeed, this is a process of mind most difficult of performance to any, especially to deaf mutes.

“One of her earliest sentences after learning the adjectives was this; she had found the matron ill, and understood that her head pained her, so she said,—‘*Smith head sick, — Laura sorry.*’

"Next she was put to the positive expression of relation to place, which she could understand. For instance, a ring was taken and placed *on* a box, then the words were spelt to her, and she repeated them from imitation. Then the ring was placed *on* a hat, and a sign given her to spell, she spelt, *ring on box*, — but being checked, and the right words given, she immediately began to exercise her judgment, and, as usual, seemed intently thinking. Then the same was repeated with a bag, a desk, and a great many other things, until at last she learned that she must name the thing *on* which the article was.

"Then the same article was put *into* the box, and the words *ring in box* given her; this puzzled her for many minutes, and she would make mistakes; — for instance, after she had learned to say correctly whether the ring was *on* or *in* a box, a drawer, a hat, a bucket, &c., if she were asked where is house, or matron, she would say *in box*. Cross-questioning, however, is seldom necessary to ascertain whether she really understands the force of the words she is learning; for when the true meaning dawns upon her mind, the light spreads to her countenance.

"In this case the perception seemed instantaneous, and the natural sign by which she expressed it was peculiar and striking: she spelt *on*, then laid one hand *on* the other; then she spelt, *in to*, and enclosed one hand *within* the other." — pp. 20, 21.

"An extract from the diary kept by her instructor will give an idea of her manner of questioning.

"December 3.

"Spent one hour in giving Laura an idea of the meaning of the words left and right. She readily conceived that left hand, meant *her* left hand, but with difficulty generalized the term. At last, however, she caught the idea, and eagerly spelt the name of her arms, hands, fingers, feet, ears, &c., as they were touched, and named them, right or left, as might be; suddenly pausing, however, and looking puzzled, she put her finger on her *nose*, and asked if that were left or right; thus she continually puzzles one: but such is her eagerness to find out one's meaning, such a zealous coöperation is there on her part, that it is a delightful task to teach her.'

"Uses to-day freely the prepositions *in* and *on*: she says, teacher sitting *in* sofa; — do not dare to correct her in such cases of anomalous usage of the preposition, but prefer to let her be in error, than shake her faith in a rule given: the corrections must be made by-and-by: the sofa having sides, she naturally says *in*.'

"In her eagerness to advance her knowledge of words, and to communicate her ideas, she coins words, and is always guided

by analogy. Sometimes her process of *word-making* is very interesting; for instance, after some time spent in giving her an idea of the abstract meaning of *alone*, she seemed to obtain it, and understanding that being *by one's self* was to be alone, or *al-one*. She was told to go to her chamber, or school, or elsewhere and return *alone*; she did so, but soon after, wishing to go with one of the little girls, she strove to express her meaning thus, Laura go *al-two*." — p. 22.

But, notwithstanding her superior mental and moral endowments, the steps of her progress are laborious and slow, which enables a careful observer to note them accurately. It is a most fortunate coincidence, (and one, without which, the whole benefit of the case to philosophy would be lost,) that the person, to whom her instruction is confided, is himself a philosopher, a man of candid and accurate habits of mind, and fully competent to distinguish and appreciate the import of all the phenomena exhibited. He has long been conversant with the most approved methods in use, in the instruction of the blind, and practically engaged in this interesting service, with what beautiful and most affecting success, let those declare, who have visited the Perkins Institution.

Being deeply interested in the case, and aware of its psychological importance, he either conducts the instruction himself, or has it done under his special direction. An exact record is kept of the process and its results.

Here are details such as the philosopher has long sought in vain. Instead of that lightning-like rapidity with which impressions are made on the infant mind, insensibly develop its latent powers, and awaken its yet unconscious ideas, — how and when cannot be traced, any more than the growth of a plant, — we have an unfolding of the faculties so gradual, that it may be detected and described, the first imperfect dawning of ideas, their increased definiteness, their order of development, their natural and acquired combinations.

With what curiosity do we peruse even the brief account of her which is given in the appendix to the report, and how anxiously do we look for the complete record which we are assured is kept of the case. There is proof, if any were wanting, that the senses simply impart their organic impressions, and furnish the occasion merely of the development of the mental powers. That most difficult and abstract of all acquisitions has been made by this child of nine years, both oral and written,

with the aid only of one sense, and that the least used in this process by such as have all their senses.

Those mental processes involved in the use of language, comparison, abstraction, generalization, are clearly hers, though as yet to a small extent. The use of signs as media of communicating thought, and doubtless of recalling ideas and impressions, is also hers, as much as it is ours. The vocabulary is yet small, but it is daily increasing, and nothing hinders its becoming as complete as our own, with the exception of the organic impressions denied her. The uncommon activity and soundness of her intellect, and the purity and definiteness of the moral sentiments, as far as these latter have been evinced, show how little the soul is beholden to mere sense for its high nature and perfection. It is merely as instruments, that the senses are valuable; its holy affections, its elementary and intuitive truths, are all its own, and not less its power of modifying, combining, and arranging materials, when supplied. As yet, Laura has few materials, but not a day is suffered to pass, without an addition to her stock. It is worthy of remark that this task of acquiring knowledge, so irksome to children in general, is to her, though performed under such peculiar disadvantages, one of high pleasure. Can we doubt that knowledge is the mind's natural food; that the appetite for it is inherent, and must abide by it in all its forms of existence?

"Having acquired the use of substantives, adjectives, verbs, prepositions, and conjunctions, it was deemed time to make the experiment of trying to teach her to *write*, and to show her that she might communicate her ideas to persons not in contact with her.

"It was amusing to witness the mute amazement with which she submitted to the process, the docility with which she imitated every motion, and the perseverance with which she moved her pencil over and over again in the same track, until she could form the letter. But when at last the idea dawned upon her, that by this mysterious process she could make other people understand what she thought, her joy was boundless.

"Never did a child apply more eagerly and joyfully to any task, than she did to this; and in a few months she could make every letter distinctly, and separate words from each other." — pp. 23, 24.

"With regard to the sense of touch, it is very acute, even for a blind person. It is shown remarkably in the readiness with which she distinguishes persons: there are forty inmates in the

female wing, with all of whom of course Laura is acquainted ; whenever she is walking through the passage-ways, she perceives by the jar of the floor, or the agitation of the air, that some one is near her, and it is exceedingly difficult to pass her without being recognised. Her little arms are stretched out, and the instant she grasps a hand, a sleeve, or even part of the dress, she knows the person, and lets them pass on with some sign of recognition.

“ The innate desire for knowledge, and the instinctive efforts which the human faculties make to exercise their functions, are shown most remarkably in Laura. Her tiny fingers are to her as eyes, and ears, and nose, and most deftly and incessantly does she keep them in motion : like the feelers of some insects which are continually agitated, and which touch every grain of sand in the path, so Laura’s arms and hands are continually in play ; and when she is walking with a person, she not only recognises everything she passes within touching distance, but by continually touching her companion’s hands she ascertains what he is doing. A person walking across a room, while she had hold on his left arm, would find it hard to take a pencil out of his waistcoat pocket with his right hand, without her perceiving it.” — p. 28.

The origin of our ideas is a point which it is less important to settle, than their nature and laws. It has, however, attracted far more attention from philosophers. A careful observation of the mind in its earlier stages forms the safest ground for conclusions here ; yet recourse has been had rarely if ever to this method of investigation. On the contrary, attempts are made to analyze the complex ideas, produced by the combined action of the senses and the intellect, and which become, long before we are aware of it, indissoluble compounds. Every system, which has been adopted as an explanation of the origin of our knowledge, has been sustained by one or more facts ; but all these theories taken together do not include the whole complex phenomena, still less their true analysis. The two grand divisions of metaphysical systems, one referring all knowledge to the senses, the other to the intellect, have at last met on common ground ; but their respective parts, in furnishing the mind, or in developing its faculties, are by no means determined. How, indeed, shall we detect the elements of an effect so exquisitely mingled and wrought by the hand of nature, as the knowledge to which every human being attains, during a few years of life in this limited abode, and with powers so imperfect

and finite? Who will undertake to discriminate mind from matter, and appreciate their proportions, in the phenomena even of sensation? Natures so dissimilar, and yet so interwoven, that while nothing can be more clear than their difference, it is impossible to mark the line of their union; while no two things can be more independent of each other, we cannot seize on the slightest manifestation of one without involving both. Matter is the medium by which we arrive at our own thoughts, and intelligence is the essential origin, the sole recipient of the qualities of matter. But the senses, which in philosophy have long been lord of the ascendant, and claimed to be the source of all the godlike thoughts of the soul, are now hiding their diminished heads. The ideal is regaining its rightful domain, and restricting them more and more to the mere threshold of the soul's temple. We cannot grant them anything beyond the honor of furnishing the occasion of opening the door, for the spirit to walk abroad in its native power and dignity, and possess herself of the beauties prepared for her alone. And some philosophers have even assumed that the external world depends on the laws of mind for its reality, as it undoubtedly does for its recognition. From the principle that the laws of the mind must regulate our cognitions, Kant infers that they must so far regulate objects. "Space and time are," according to him, "subjective," "the formal condition of all phenomena internal and external," "they have no objective reality, but lie ready in the mind, *a priori*, and are called up by the impressions we receive from external objects through the senses." Now if this view be correct, if time and space are purely subjective, then it must follow, that if mind were annihilated, time and space could not exist. We conceive that matter, or the external world could exist, even if mind were annihilated, (a mere supposition, of course, to illustrate our idea,) for our convictions of its objectivity are indestructible; but there are things which we perceive to be essentially subjective, such as virtue, beauty, truth, thought; these cannot be, if mind is not. But events might occur, the heavenly bodies perform their revolutions, and preserve their relative distances even if no mind existed to note them. There would be duration between the rising and the setting of the sun, and space over which the earth passed in her annual revolution. The conception of them would be wanting, but this conception is not the whole. Space is no sensation; it is neither feeling, sight, nor sound, but the absence of these; the idea is

unique, it cannot be explained ; it, however, needs no explanation ; we are only puzzled as to the way in which we obtained it. It belongs to the class of the acquired perceptions of the senses, in which organic impressions, and inferences from them made by the mind, become combined into one complex idea, whose elements it is almost impossible to distinguish. The share which the mind has in this process is essential, but the space between two trees, for instance, has an existence as truly objective, as the trees themselves have. If this be so, space cannot be purely subjective.

Locke was the first to observe, or at least to explain, the fact, that our idea of time comes from internal succession ; like space it is unique ; it is not any event or experience, but the absence of these, the separation between them.

Our *conviction* of the universality and necessity of space and time are purely subjective ; but the absolute and the universal are neither subjective nor objective, but existences wholly unconditioned. An exact history of the acquisition of these ideas might throw light on the subject ; and we often wish we could have a course of observations on the early development of the human mind, as patiently made and as accurately recorded as those on the habits of insects, or the phenomena of animalculæ.

Laura Bridgman must have formed the ideas of space and time long before she came to this asylum, which was three years ago. Yet, perhaps, some new views on these difficult points may be gained, by closely observing the way in which she applies them. That she can estimate duration with surprising accuracy is shown by her being able to strike the length of the notes of music correctly on a piano, and her knowledge of space seems also to be nearly as perfect as ours.

“ Those persons, who hold that the capacity of perceiving and measuring the lapse of time is an innate and distinct faculty of the mind, may deem it an important fact, that Laura evidently can measure time so accurately as to distinguish between a half and whole note of music.

“ Seated at the pianoforte she will strike the notes in a measure like the following, quite correctly.



“ Now it will be perceived that she must have clear percep-

tion of lapse of time, in order to strike the two eighths at the right instant, for in the first measure they occur at the second beat, in the second measure at the third beat." — p. 26.

"Her judgment of distances and of relations of place is very accurate; she will rise from her seat, go straight towards a door, put out her hand just at the right time, and grasp the handle with precision.

"When she runs against a door which is shut, but which she expected to find open, she does not fret, but rubs her head and laughs, as though she perceived the ludicrous position of a person flat against a door trying to walk through it.

"The constant and tireless exercise of her feelers gives her a very accurate knowledge of everything about the house; so that if a new article, a bundle, bandbox, or even a new book is laid anywhere in the apartments which she frequents, it would be but a short time before in her ceaseless rounds she would find it, and from something about it she would generally discover to whom it belonged.

"She perceives the approach of persons by the undulations of the air striking her face; and she can distinguish the step of those who tread hard, and jar the floor." — pp. 28, 29.

This case offers a field for interesting observation in the development of the moral powers. Conscience is described by Jouffroy as the result of a gradual acquisition of the abstract idea of order. According to this, Laura should as yet give scarcely any proof of a consciousness of this faculty; but on the contrary we find unequivocal evidence of her being possessed of the ideas of right and wrong. She is susceptible of praise, blame, shame, and the emotion of self-approbation. That sense of responsibility, which is the condition if not the essence of free agency, is plainly hers. From how small a stock of perceptions and facts has this great idea been evolved or awakened in her mind, showing, as we think, that conscience or the moral principle is original, and not of secondary formation; that it comes forth simultaneously with the experience of free-agency, and a perception of the relation of motives to acts, and of our own acts to the production of good or evil to others and ourselves.

The different explanations of the moral sentiments, which have been offered, prove that this class of phenomena are very complicated, and that care has not been taken to distinguish "between the nature of moral sentiments and the criterion of

moral acts." * The selfish systems, the sentimental, and the rational, are each sustained by just, though partial views ; they do not, however, exhaust the subject. The terms, good and evil, have become so generalized, that they include much which is not referable to will, while to such only as involve responsibility, namely, *are* connected with the will, can the terms right and wrong be applied. We have an intuitive idea of good, absolute and universal ; how far this is abstracted from original objects, in which the good is real and positive, and how far it is this association transferred to other objects, is yet to be explained. This idea of good is connected in our mind, as ends to means, with the sense of accountability, which gives the character of moral, for moral phenomena can never be found disconnected with volition. Take away volition, and we may admire, or even love, but we cannot praise, or blame. These and similar questions of psychology may receive light from an accurate record of the moral and intellectual development of minds, whose unfolding is delayed and gradual, in consequence of the loss of one or more of their senses.

Nor let it be supposed that such inquiries are merely speculative and curious. Those arts, whose principles are to be sought in the philosophy of mind, such as education, government, and the fine arts, are indispensable to society. Man has exercised them from the earliest ages ; but with what rudeness and imperfection need not be shown. The truths of philosophy, as far as they have been announced, are easily comprehended, and made available to every mind. The difficulty of understanding metaphysical works lies principally in the mixture of errors with truths, and in the vagueness of the views of their writers. These investigations lead to the region of the ideal, and deal with abstractions. We are not, therefore, removed from the real and the intelligible. Abstraction is a process performed by every one, even the child and the illiterate, in matters which come under their attention, as perfectly as by the philosopher. The only difference is, that the latter has observed the process of mind, and carried it out to a higher degree of perfection. The ideal is the soul's home ; and she is abroad only when she is employed with the tangible. Truths once disclosed will eventually be adopted and acted on. Not one was ever announced in vain, though many have given

* Mackintosh.

centuries of sway to the errors connected with them. For truth, like our own precious souls, when ushered into life can never die, but will in the end cast off the disguises and contaminations, which cling to its earlier stages of existence.

Many truths lie scattered through the pages of philosophical systems, which will yet be gathered up, and carry with them the names of the great men by whom they were first disclosed. Why are these permitted to remain still hid amid the errors and fancies incident to their period? Some attempts have been made to collect them into one eclectic system; but where is the volume to which we can go for the pure admitted truths of mental philosophy? This as a preliminary step is indispensable. We cannot disregard the wisdom of the past. The philosophers of that period were as deeply engaged in the study, as those of our own times. They discovered as much, settled as many questions, as perhaps any one individual can hope to do now. In the voluminous, but rich pages of these writers, may be seen some of the most interesting aspects of the human mind, its loftiest flights, its deepest investigations, its most remarkable errors, and, we cannot doubt, many of its essential truths. In addition to their being the repositories of the wisdom of the past, they have a further claim to our study and gratitude. This consists in the spirituality, and intellectual development, which they nourished and brought out both in their authors and readers. Their voice was heard amid the din of earthly pursuits, sensual indulgence, and schemes of ambition, for it addressed a real principle of our nature, and turned the attention of men to the divine inhabitant of their own bosoms. The admiration these works commanded, and the avidity with which they have been read, must not be ascribed entirely to the genius of their authors, but to the real worth of the subject.

Let us, then, study and collect these valuable, but as yet scattered hints, and add them to the results of later observers; the smallest specimen, if it be a true one, is of use in the cabinet of the naturalist. We must not look for a system of philosophy in our own day, but each observer of human nature in his daily walks may lay up something for the future architect, who in the fulness of time will appear. We look to the record of Laura Bridgman as a valuable repository of psychological facts; and this interesting creature, so excluded as it were from the privileges of her race, in becoming the object of sympathy and instruction, in entering the world of ideas, through

new and difficult passes, opened for her by the hand of benevolence, will more than repay the obligation by the valuable light she will throw on that most important of all the departments of knowledge, the philosophy of mind.

Many other topics are suggested by reading the reports, particularly that of printing for the blind, to which we wished to direct the attention of our readers ; but we refer them to the report itself, whose clear, satisfactory, and unambitious statements, cannot fail to call up an interest in the Institution, and an admiration and respect for those who, with such patience and devotedness, carry out the benevolent purposes of its founders and patrons. We also recommend their visiting the Institution, not merely from curiosity, although in this view they would be repaid, but for their own instruction. Here they will see benevolence working in its highest and surest paths ; here they will learn what power is given to the spirit to pursue its upward, onward course through every difficulty, if it will but be true to itself. And here they may receive a lesson of resignation and cheerfulness under the privations of life, and be assured that, if our usual sources of happiness and usefulness should be cut off, we may open to ourselves others sufficient to nourish and employ those faculties, which are given not to lie idle, but to be used for our own and others' good. Duty, knowledge, love, are never beyond our reach, while there is a single sense or power left, by which the soul can recognise the external, or commune with itself.

L. M.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Two Articles from the Princeton Review, concerning the Transcendental Philosophy of the Germans, and of Cousin, and its Influence on Opinion in this Country. Cambridge: J. Owen. 1840. pp. 100. — We consider the religious public to lie under great obligations to the Princeton Reviewers for their elaborate accounts of German Transcendental Philosophy, and to Mr. Norton for procuring their republication in a separate form in this part of the country. Some information like that contained in this pamphlet was needed, to enable those not acquainted with the dark recesses of the German language, and the darker ones of

German wisdom, to form some satisfactory judgment concerning the novelties in religious speculation and religious practice, which just now are attracting a good deal of attention. We do not propose at present to enter into any of the speculative questions, many and deep, naturally suggested by this exposition of Transcendentalism. Our object is merely, as chroniclers of passing events in the religious world, to put the title of this pamphlet on record, and furnish such extracts from it as may enable our distant readers, who may not have it in their power to procure the treatise itself, to know what the opinions are which it sets forth, and which philosophers abroad, and some it would seem at home, regard as a form of faith transcending that of the Gospel. We believe that all those among us, who, from what they have heard here and there in a lecture-room or in conversation, have been disposed to look upon the new philosophy with favor, as something that seemed to promise a new and more spiritual and vigorous form of Christianity, will need no more than what they will find in these Princeton Reviews to satisfy them, that to exchange any form which Christianity assumes among any of our sects, for any form which Transcendentalism has assumed in Germany, would be to exchange light for darkness, truth for error, the word of God for the dark guesses of man. We are happy to have been able, in the present number of our journal, to present an analysis of the work of Strauss, which we suppose may be regarded as the probable, if not the necessary termination of the speculations, comprehended under the general term of German Transcendentalism. We apprehend that few, after reading that analysis, will entertain any other feeling than one of deep abhorrence for a book, which, by philosophic tricks so fantastic and childish, aims to annihilate the Gospel. Whatever may be true of Germany, it is not yet true here, that there are any who, for the Gospels according to the Evangelists, are willing to receive the Gospels according to Strauss.

And we found our opinion in our conviction, that among us the tendency and the movement are toward belief, not toward unbelief; the desire is for religion, for more religion, and better religion, not for infidelity and atheism. Failure to realize their aspirations for a higher form of Christianity may leave some in doubt or unbelief; but it will be from no preference of such a state, on its own account. We believe that there are no more religiously disposed persons in our community than some, at least, of those, if not all, who have either been examining into the claims of Transcendentalism, or have absolutely adopted its conclusions. It is and has been, we know, in no spirit of levity

or indifference, in no cold-hearted aversion to an acknowledgment of the being of a God, that any have seemed to embrace, or have actually embraced, the Pantheistic philosophy. There may have been superficial inquiry, hasty and rash generalization, boastful claims of higher and better light, natural pride of opinion, and very natural speculative error; but there has been, we are very sure, nothing of what is meant by the spirit of infidelity; but, on the contrary, a spirit of belief and love, and a real devotion to the interests of truth and virtue. We may well grieve that Pantheism, — the public secret of Germany, — gives any signs of becoming the public secret of America; that the genius of Cousin should avail through its attractive speculations, in even a single individual, to substitute a mystical faith in a God that is no God, in a Christianity that is no Christianity, for the faith of the Bible, which so long has answered so well. But, though we doubt not, if such speculations prevailed, that Religion, not only Christianity, but Religion, would for a time decline or perish; we do not believe, on the other hand, that in the case of the few individuals, who at present may be regarded as having received them, they have had any effect injurious to character, or have so much as overshadowed religious hope, in their own view; we suppose there has been a positive gain, both in the strength of virtue and the firmness of hope. Such we suppose to be the truth of all great heresiarchs. They have departed from the prevalent faith, not for something worse and less efficacious, but for something which they esteemed to be better and more efficacious. To themselves their new doctrines have proved so. It is to their followers and imitators, to those who push their opinions to consequences, they themselves did not see or would not acknowledge to be legitimately deduced, the evil is to be ascribed, that has at length been justly charged upon them. Thus Hegel, if we may believe what we read, is not to be made answerable, except indirectly, for the extravagances in doctrine and morals, that are the characteristics of the "extreme left."

Thus much we feel bound to say, — and we say it with a deep persuasion of its truth, — as to the spirit which actuates some among us. What their doctrines are we do not profess to understand; nor do we know where to look for any explicit statement of them. The Princeton pamphlet cannot be taken as their exponent. However there may be some, one or two, who might admit that they agree essentially with the doctrines of Fichte or Hegel, of Strauss or Cousin, as to the nature of God, human immortality, and the inspiration of Jesus;

we believe that there are but one or two, and that for the remainder they would indignantly repudiate them. But while we accord with heartiness our love and approbation of the spirit which actuates our "modern philosophers," we have none to accord for the doctrines set forth in this pamphlet, whether truly or not, descriptive of one or many among us. They are truly doctrines at which reason stands aghast. They annihilate God, the human soul, and Christianity; or leave only names, phantasms, shadows, where the glorious substance was. As our correspondent says of the volume of Strauss, "we never read so melancholy a book," so we may say of this exposition of Transcendentalism, we never read so melancholy a book. And what made us more sad than even the fatal doctrines delivered in it was the thought, forced upon us as we read, how the human mind will persist in running round the circle of exploded opinions again and again, grasping at as a novelty what was old two thousand years ago and more, and renouncing the revelation for which the ancients earnestly prayed, in favor of the very dogmas of which *they* felt the vanity and insufficiency, from the region of which they were ever hoping to escape into a light and truth that should be indeed heaven-descended.

We have said that this pamphlet of the Princeton Reviewers cannot be in justice taken as an exponent of the opinions of those among us, who have obtained the name of Transcendentalists. Still we suppose we do no injustice when we say that, in our opinion, the tendency of prevailing speculations is toward the doctrines here developed. By a few extracts we shall endeavor to show what some at least of these doctrines are; but not having at our command the room we hoped for, our view of them will be necessarily incomplete, yet not so incomplete as to be without some value. We commend to the attention of the reader the pamphlet itself.

The first division of the pamphlet is devoted to a review of the philosophies, — considered especially in their theological bearings, — of Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, and Cousin; the second is occupied by a more full account of Hegel and his followers. We must at present, at least, pass over Kant, Fichte, and Schelling, and come at once to Hegel, whose philosophy seems to be a concentration of the virtues or vices of those that had preceded. In the paragraphs which follow, the Reviewers give a brief sketch of Hegel's system. Let the reader ponder and digest it.

"All philosophy, according to Hegel, is but an attempt to answer a simple question, namely, *Quid est?* And the answer to this involves all Truth, all Reason; for whatever is, is Reason. All reality is reasonable, all that is reasonable is real. Hence the only real existence

is the ideas of Reason. All reality (*Wirklichkeit*) being thoroughly rational, is also divine; yea is God revealing himself or developing himself. God reveals himself in creation, or in the universe, by a series of eternal unfoldings, some in matter, some in mind; and thus the Deity is in a perpetual effort towards self-realization. The history of Physics is, therefore, the necessary career of divine self-evolution; indeed, God thinks worlds, just as the mind thinks thoughts.

"In order to philosophize aright, we must lose our own personality in God, who is chiefly revealed in the acts of the human mind. In the infinite developments of divinity, and the infinite progress towards self-consciousness, the greatest success is reached in the exertions of human reason. In men's minds, therefore, is the highest manifestation of God. God recognises himself best in human reason, which is a consciousness of God (*Gottesbewusstseyn*.) And it is by human reason, that the world (hitherto without thought, and so without existence, mere negation) comes into consciousness: thus God is revealed in the world.

"God is the Idea of all Ideas, or the absolute Idea; hence our ideal thought is divine thought, and this is no other than reason. 'The doctrine of the being of God is no other than that of the revelation of himself in the idea of him.' 'God *exists* only as knowledge (*Wissen*); in this knowledge, and as such, he knows himself, and it is this very knowledge, *which is his existence*.' We may therefore say with truth, *God exists as an Idea*.

"After thus arriving at an ideal God, we learn, that Philosophy and Religion draw us away from our little selves, so that our separate consciousness is dissolved in that of God. Philosophy is Religion; and 'true Religion frees man from all that is low, and from himself, from clinging to *I-hood* (*Ichheit*) and subjectivity, and helps him to life in God, as the Truth, and thereby to true life.' In this oblation of personal identity, we must not claim property even in our own thoughts. By a step beyond Emmonism, Hegel teaches, that it is God who thinks in us; nay, that it is precisely that which thinks in us, which is God. Marheineke himself manifests tokens of alarm, when he states this doctrine. The pure and primal *substance* manifests itself as the subject; and 'true knowledge of the absolute is the absolute itself.' There is but a step to take, and we arrive at the tenet, that the universe and God are one. The Hegelians attempt to distinguish this from the doctrine of Spinoza, but their distinctions are inappreciable; 't is the same rope at either end they twist;' their scheme is Pantheism. And as God is revealed by all the phenomena of the world's history, he is partly revealed by moral action, and consequently by sin, no less than by holiness. Sin is, therefore, a part of the necessary evolution of the divine principle; or rather, in any sense which can affect the conscience, there is no evil in sin, — there is no sin. This is a part of the philosophy of Hegel, which has given great pain to pious men in Germany, who have repeatedly complained of it as subverting the first principles of morality, not merely in theory but in practice; and begetting a fatalism, which threatens alike the foundations of religion and of state. A late pantheistic poet teaches us, that all which we regard as sin, is necessary, and therefore good, and may, to other intelligences, justly appear most lovely! But there are conclusions of the new phi-

losophy still more surprising, for which our inchoate metaphysicians should be getting ready. It is well said by an acute writer already quoted, that when, according to the demands of Schelling, we annihilate first the object and then the subject, the remainder is zero. Though Schelling is not known to have admitted this, his critics were not slow to perceive it. Schulze, in particular, declared, that, according to this system, *Everything is Nothing, and Nothing is Everything*; and Koppen called this the philosophy of Absolute Nothing. It was reserved for Hegel to abandon all the scruples of six thousand years, and publish the discovery, — certainly the most wonderful in the history of human research, — that *Something and Nothing are the same!* In declaring it, he almost apologizes, for he says, that this proposition appears so paradoxical, that it may readily be supposed that it is not seriously maintained. Yet he is far from being ambiguous. Something and Nothing are the same. The Absolute, of which so much is vaunted, is nothing. But the conclusion, which is, perhaps, already anticipated by the reader's mind, and which leaves us incapacitated for comment, is this, — we shudder while we record it, — that, after the exhaustive abstraction is carried to infinity in search of God, we arrive at nothing. *God himself is nothing!* — pp. 27–30.

In offering, in the second part of the pamphlet, a more extended view of Hegel's philosophy, the Reviewers say, "we shall avail ourselves of the authority of such men as Leo, Hengstenberg, and Tholuck, men of the highest rank in their own country for talents, learning, and integrity. We shall let them describe this new form of philosophy, which is turning the heads of our American scholars, inflating some and dementing others; and we shall leave it to our transcendental countrymen, if they see cause to accuse these German scholars and Christians of ignorance and misrepresentation."

"It is well known," they go on, "to all who have paid the least attention to the subject, that the prevalent system of philosophy in Germany is that of Hegel; and that this system has, to a remarkable degree, diffused itself among all classes of educated men. It is not confined to recluse professors or speculative theologians, but finds its warmest advocates among statesmen and men of the world. It has its poets, its popular as well as its scientific journals. It is, in short, the form in which the German mind now exists and exhibits itself to surrounding nations, just as much as Deism or Atheism was characteristic of France during the Reign of Terror. That a system thus widely diffused should present different phases might be naturally anticipated. But it is still one system, called by one name, and, despite of occasional recriminations among its advocates, recognised by themselves as one whole. The general characteristic of this school is pantheism. This, as has been said, is 'the public secret of Germany;' and 'we must,' says Hengstenberg, 'designedly close our own eyes on all that occurs around us, if we would deny the truth of this assertion.' And on the following page, he says, that, though there are a few of the followers of Hegel, who endeavor to reconcile his principles with Christianity, yet they are

spoken of with contempt by their associates, who, as a body, are 'with the clearest consciousness, and as consequently as possible, devoted to pantheism.' They are, moreover, he adds, hailed as brothers by the advocates of popular pantheism, who denounce, under the name of 'pietism,' at once Christianity, Judaism, and Deism. This was written four years ago, a long period in the history of modern philosophy, and, since that time, the character of the school has developed itself with constantly increasing clearness.

"In allusion to the French Chamber of Deputies, this school is divided into two parts, the right and the left. The former teach the principles of the philosophy in an abstruse form, as a philosophy; the other gives them a more popular and intelligible form. This latter division, again, is divided into the centre left, and extreme left. The one preserving some decorum and regard to public morals in their statements; and the other recklessly carrying out their principles to the extreme of licentiousness. To the extreme left belong the class which is designated the 'Young Germany,' of which Heine is one of the most prominent leaders. This class profess themselves the true disciples of the extreme right; the extreme right acknowledge their fellowship with the centre left, and the centre left with the extreme left." — pp. 73, 74.

Hegel's philosophy was assailed by Professor Leo of Halle, and it is from his work "*Hegeligen*," or "*Hegelians of the Left*," that the Reviewers draw up their account. Leo charges Hegel and his followers with the denial of a personal God, with turning the Gospels into a mythology, with the denial of the immortality of the soul, and finally with dishonesty and immorality.

"Leo's first charge is this: 'This party denies the existence of a personal God. They understand by God, an unconscious power, which pervades all persons, and which arrives to self-consciousness only in the personality of men. That is, this party teaches atheism without reserve.' With regard to this charge, Hengstenberg remarks: 'Whoever has read Strauss's '*Life of Jesus*,' and Vatke's '*Biblical Theology*,' where pantheism, which every Christian must regard as only one form of atheism, is clearly avowed, cannot ask whether the party in general hold these doctrines, but simply whether the particular persons, mentioned by Leo, belong, as to this point, to the party. About this who can doubt, when he hears Professor Michelet say, beside many other things of like import, 'God is the eternal movement of the universal principle, constantly manifesting itself in individual existences, and which has no true objective existence but in these individuals, which pass away again into the infinite;' [in other words, God is but the name given to the ceaseless flow of being:] when he hears him denouncing, as unworthy of the name, 'the theistical Hegelians, who believe in a personal God in another world?' — p. 22. 'Professor Vischer,' adds Hengstenberg, 'is so far from being ashamed of pantheism, that he glories in his shame, and represents it as the greatest honor of his friend Strauss, that he has 'logically carried out the prin-

ciple of the immanence of God in the world.' That the Professors Gans and Benary agree with him and with Strauss not only in general, but in this particular point, Michelet, 'certain of their assent,' has openly declared. According to Dr. Kühne, Hegel's God 'is not Jehovah;' he is 'the ever-streaming immanence of spirit in matter.' To this representation, Dr. Meyen agrees, and says, 'I make no secret, that I belong to the extreme left of Hegel's school. I agree with Strauss perfectly, and consider him (seine Tendenz) as in perfect harmony with Hegel.' Another writer, the anonymous author of the book '*Leo vor Gericht*,' ridicules the charge of atheism as though it were a trifle. He represents the public as saying to the charge, 'What does it mean? Mr. Professor Leo is beyond our comprehension; Wodan, heathenism, Hegel's God, atheism! ha! ha! ha!' * * * "Stripped of its verbiage, the doctrine is, that men are God; there is no other God than the ever-flowing race of man; or that the universal principle arrives to self-consciousness only in the human race, and, therefore, the highest state of God is man. The extreme left of the school trouble themselves but little with words without meaning. They speak out boldly, so that all the world may understand. 'We are free,' says Heine, 'and need no thundering tyrant. We are of age, and need no fatherly care. We are not the hand-work of any great mechanic. Theism is a religion for slaves, for children, for Genevese, for watch-makers.'" — pp. 76-79.

Hegel is next charged with turning the Gospels into a mythology.

"It is strange," say the Reviewers, "that men holding such views should trouble themselves at all with the Gospel. As this system, however, has arisen in a Christian country, there was but one of two things to do, either to say, that real Christianity means just what this system teaches, or to explode the whole evangelical history. Some have taken the one course, and some the other, while some unite both. That is, they reject the Gospel history, as a history; they represent it as a mere mythology; but, as the ancient philosophers made the mythology of the Greeks and Romans a series of allegories containing important truths, so do these modern philosophers represent the Gospels as a mere collection of fables, destitute in almost every case of any foundation in fact, but still expressive of the hidden mysteries of their system. It is by a mytho-symbolical interpretation of this history, that the truth must be sought. The '*Life of Jesus*,' by Strauss, is a laborious compilation of all the critical objections against the New Testament history, which he first thus endeavored to overturn, and then to account for and explain as a Christian mythology. 'Had this book,' says Hengstenberg, 'been published in England, it would have been forgotten in a couple of months.' In Germany it has produced a sensation almost without a parallel. It has become the rallying-ground of all the enemies of Christianity, open and secret, and the number of its advocates and secret abettors is, therefore, exceedingly great." — p. 82.

In the first pages of this number the theological reader will be
VOL. XXVIII. — 3D S. VOL. X. NO. III. 49

gratified by seeing a pretty full analysis of this famous book of Strauss, which for the Gospels gives us fables.

"Leo's third charge against this party is, that they deny the immortality of the soul. 'This point also needs no further proof,' says Hengstenberg, 'since the former have been proved. With the personality of God falls of course that of man, which is the necessary condition of an existence hereafter. To a pantheist, 'the subject which would assert its individual personality is evil itself.' (Michelet.) It is regarded as godless, even to cherish the desire of immortality. According to the doctrine of the eternal incarnation of God, it must appear an intolerable assumption, for an individual to lay claim to that which belongs only to the race; he must freely and gladly cast himself beneath the wheels of the idol car, that he may make room for other incarnations of the spirit, better adapted to the advancing age. The proofs, however, of this particular charge, are peculiarly abundant. Hegel himself, who ought not to be represented as so different from the Hegelingen, since the difference between them is merely formal and not essential, involved himself in the logical denial of the immortality of the soul. This has been fully proved with regard to him and Dr. Marheineke, in a previous article in this journal, (that is, the *Kirchen-Zeitung*.) It has also been demonstrated by Weise in the work, 'Die philosophische Geheimlehre von der Unsterblichkeit,' as far as Hegel is concerned; and with Weise Becker has more recently signified his agreement. If this happens in the green tree, what will become of the dry?"

"'Richter came out with such a violent polemic against the doctrine of immortality, that the party had to disavow him, for fear of the public indignation. When, however, they thought it could be done unnoticed or without danger, they acknowledged the same doctrine. Michelet endeavors most earnestly to free Hegel's system from the charge of countenancing the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, as from a reproach. He speaks out clear and plain his own views, in words which, according to him, Hegel himself had spoken; 'Thought alone is eternal, and not the body and what is connected with its individuality,' that is, the whole personality, which, according to this system, depends entirely on the body. . . . Ruge ridicules the scruples of theologians, as to whether 'Philosophy can make out the immortality of the human soul; whether philosophy has any ethics; whether it can justify the gross doctrines of hell, of wailing and gnashing the teeth, &c.' 'Such vulgar craving,' he says, 'is beginning to mix itself with purely philosophical and spiritual concerns, and threatens to merge philosophy in its troubled element. The more this dogmatical confusion arrogates to itself; the more this senseless justification of the wretched errors of orthodoxy dishonors the free science of philosophy, the more necessary will it be to cast out this dunghill of nonsense to the common mind, (in das gemeine Bewusstsein.)'" — pp. 82-84.

That part of Leo's last charge which relates to "Dishonesty," we must omit, but add what relates to immorality generally.

"'With this last charge, Leo,' says Hengstenberg, 'entered upon the department of morals; and we could wish that he had dwelt longer

on this part of the subject. It would then have been shown how this party are laboring to destroy all that Rationalism has left of religion and morality. What their ethics are, may be readily inferred from their religion. Where there is no personal God, there is no law, which men need fear to violate, as the expression of his will. If the distinction between God and man is removed, if man is set in the place of God, then nothing is more natural, than that men should without reserve, and upon principle, give themselves up to all their inclinations and lusts. To suppress these desires, is to hinder the development of God; if they do not become God as developed, they do become the nascent God; if not good in themselves, they are relatively good, as transition points in the progress of development. It is not sin that is sinful, but only impenitence, that is, cleaving to the relative good, which is vulgarly called evil, as though it were the absolute good. These painful results of the doctrine of this school are everywhere, with the most logical consequence, avowed and brought to light.' — p. 88.

Such are the charges brought by the Professor Leo against Hegel's system of philosophy, and so are they made out. This is done at much greater length in the tract from which we quote, and to that we refer the reader for fuller information. If it should prove in further publications that the Pantheistic school has been misrepresented by its orthodox opposers in Germany, or here, we shall be prompt to do justice to one party as well as the other. But, although some of the preceding statements may require modifications and abatements to bring them within the exact limits of truth, we cannot believe that the main features of the system, as they are here set forth, will be found to be greatly erroneous or distorted.

In regard to Cousin, no one we should suppose could doubt, who considers language which he has used, whether he also is to be numbered with the Pantheistic philosophers of Germany. The Reviewers say;

"As he has given the world nothing in the form of a system, it is only by these occasional intimations, that his readers can judge how far he adopts the ideas of the German school, whence all his opinions are borrowed. These intimations, however, are sufficiently frequent and sufficiently clear to make it plain, that he is a denier of God and of the Gospel. This has been clearly proved in the article in this Review already referred to. He uses almost the very language of the Hegelians in expressing his views of the nature of God. 'God exists as an idea,' say the Hegelians; 'these ideas,' that is, of the infinite, finite, and the relation between them, 'are God himself,' says Cousin. According to the Hegelians, God arrives to consciousness in man; and so Cousin teaches; 'God returns to himself in the consciousness of man.' The German school teaches, that everything that exists is God in a certain stage of development; so also Cousin; 'God is space and number, essence and life, indivisibility and totality, principle, end, and centre, at the summit of being and at its lowest degree, infinite and finite to-

gether, triple in a word, that is to say, at the same time God, nature, and humanity. In fact, if God is not everything, he is nothing.' Surely there can be but one opinion among Christians about a system, which admits of no God but the universe, which allows no intelligence or consciousness to the infinite Spirit but that to which he attains in the human soul, which makes man the highest state of God. And we should think there could be, among the sane, but one opinion of the men, who, dressed in gowns and bands, and ministering at God's altars, are endeavoring to introduce these blasphemous doctrines into our schools, colleges, and churches." — pp. 94, 95.

We have thus given a brief sketch of German Transcendentalism, as exhibited in the tract before us. The Princeton Reviewers express alarm at what they understand to be the progress of such doctrines among the Unitarians of Boston and its neighborhood. "We have evidence enough," they say, "that this pantheistic philosophy has set its cloven foot in America." And again; "We learn with pain, that among the Unitarians of Boston and its vicinity, there are those who affect to embrace the pantheistic creed." We can assure these gentlemen, that they who even "affect to embrace" this creed are very few. We know of but a single individual whom the public has any sufficient ground for regarding as a believer of it. From the published writings of Mr. Emerson, quoted by the Reviewers, and their accordance with the language quoted from the German philosophers, it may with great apparent certainty be inferred that he is of their school; and beside him there are a few others, who, if not to be termed followers, yet hold generally with him. But it is by no means a safe conclusion, the Reviewers must understand, that because Mr. Emerson was admired as a lecturer, he was therefore received as a master or authority in either philosophy or religion; for we suppose it true that not an individual out of his crowd of hearers at the close of his lectures could have stated with any confidence what his religious or philosophical system was; whether he himself was theist, pantheist, or atheist. One might have an opinion; but he could refer to no argument of the lecturer, on which he founded it. Those lectures were brilliant flights of the imagination, beautiful streams of poetry, very often instructive and elevating homilies upon life and duty, upon man and society, but they were not clear expositions of doctrine, or systematic statements of opinion, or labored defences of one philosophy or another. At the close of the lectures the hearer knew little more of the lecturer's opinions, than before. All he knew was, that he had been treated to a succession of beautiful moral pictures, which, like the pictures of a crowded gallery, had passed rapidly before him, and left pleasing but vague impressions on his mind. The converts of Mr.

Emerson, if he made any, were converts not to his opinions, but simply to admiration of himself as a poet, a moralizer, and a rhetorician. But, however many there may be who hold with him or of him in the community at large, we do not believe there is one occupying a pulpit in the Unitarian body who embraces either the pantheism, or the sort of Christianity detailed in the extracts given above. That there are many both in the pulpit and out of it, who estimate the miracles of the Gospel at a very different value from that which is put upon them by others, to whose minds miracles have little or no force as evidence of the divine authority of Jesus, — yet at the same time not doubting or denying them as facts, — but to whom other evidence of a different kind is omnipotent, we know very well; but we do not know what that has to do with the Transcendentalism set forth in this pamphlet. We presume the Princeton Reviewers would be slow to accuse him of infidelity, who, while with all his heart and all his reason, he admitted the historical reality of Christ's miracles, could not feel that they approached in their powers of conviction, the character of Jesus, his life, and the divine truths which he uttered. Yet we suppose this to be the extent of the Transcendentalism of most of those to whom this loose term is applied. Of course upon such there can be charged no hostility to, or defection from Christianity. But if we are mistaken in this, if any, proceeding farther, reduce the inspiration of Jesus to ordinary human inspiration, explain away his miracles into *myths*, place him upon the same level in all respects, except in *degree* of religious wisdom and philosophy, with other teachers, acknowledge no authority of God in him or his works beyond that authority of God, which accompanies everything absolutely true and good, then indeed such, in our judgment, are not *speculatively* Christians, any more than the old Platonists would be were they now living, or than are now Jews or Chinese. They may be good men, devout men, religious men, philosophers, saints, but it were a partial, foolish use of language to call them Christians. Christian stands not for virtue alone, but for belief as well. He is not Christian who has only goodness. He indeed possesses what is better than Christianity; he possesses that which Christ was given to create in the soul; his virtue is the greater, and Christianity the less. Still he is not a Christian, for the same reason that the Jew is not a Mahomedan. Christianity, that is, is not only virtue, but belief also.

ספר הישר, or the Book of Jasher, referred to in Joshua and Second Samuel, faithfully translated from the original Hebrew into English. New York: published by M. M. Noah, and A. S. Gould, at 144 Nassau Street. 1840. 8vo. pp. xxiv. and 268. — Both the title page and the preface of this work pretend that it is the ancient Book of Jasher, twice referred to by name in the Old Testament. Mr. Noah in his preface says distinctly, "I have no hesitation in pronouncing it a *work of great antiquity and interest*, and a work that is entitled — to a great circulation among those who take pleasure in studying the Scripture." p. vii. The translator adds, that with some doubtful exceptions, it is "a venerable monument of antiquity," and is, without the smallest doubt, "a copy of the book referred to in Josh. x. 13, and 2 Samuel, i. 18." Its contents "confirm the great and inestimable truths which are recorded in divine history." Such a work must be of great value, especially if it contain, as it pretends to do, "*interesting particulars not mentioned in the Bible*," relating to such worthies as Jannes and Jambres, and Balaam the son of Beor. Still farther, to enhance this interest to the highest degree, the Hebrew preface here translated relates the wonderful preservation of the book, — that during the destruction of Jerusalem, a Roman officer, in a secret place in a house, discovered a cask full of sacred books, and beside it an old man reading the same. The old man and the soldier and the cask of old books are rescued from peril, and find repose at last in the city of Sevilla, (Seville) of which anon. Out of this cask, in due time, came forth the Book of Jasher, "the best and most valuable of all." He says it is called the "Book of Jasher," that is, the *correct* book, [!] because its "transactions" follow in their regular historical order. Finally, there is the Hebrew Printer's Preface, of "the humble worm and no man, Joseph," son of Samuel the Little, who mentions his anxiety lest this work should come to an untimely end. Prefixed to this volume are testimonials from three distinguished Hebrew scholars, Professors Nordheimer, Turner, and Bush, who attest to the general correctness of the translation. Another gentleman, Mr. "H. V. Nathan, minister of the English and German synagogue, Kingston, Jamaica," says, our "translator is an eminent scholar." In our remarks we shall not go behind the testimony of these scholars, who speak only of the merits of the translation, but pass no judgment on the book itself.

Such then are the pretensions of the book. It is announced as an *authentic*, if not an *inspired* work, written in part before the death of Joshua. Now the book is a sheer forgery from

beginning to end; it is full of anacronisms, profanities, and nameless abominations. It contradicts the Bible, and is inconsistent with itself. It is at variance with reason and religion, and is beside one of the most stupid and weak forgeries we remember ever to have seen. If the original book of Jasher ever existed after the time of the Maccabees, it has left no vestige of itself. No early Christian scholar knew anything of the book. Origen found manuscripts in a "cask," but knew nothing of the book of Jasher; Josephus was equally ignorant of it, and the Jewish writers upon the Scriptures show very plainly by their explanations of Josh. x. 13, and 2 Sam. i. 18, that they knew of no such separate book. Some of them say the Book of Jasher is *Genesis*; others that it includes the *whole Pentateuch*, and such explanations they would never have given had they known this present book as authentic; and it is scarcely possible a book of such great "antiquity and interest" should remain unknown to them till the seventeenth century.

It is evident from the book itself, that it is not the primitive Book of Jasher, for the first Hebrew Editor says it was generally called the "Generations of Adam;" and the most careless reader sees that the author had the Pentateuch and Book of Joshua before him, and was besides familiar with the rest of the Old Testament, from which very many passages have been borrowed. It contains fables and exegetical remarks borrowed from the Talmuds. — For example, we find Rabbi Eliezer's opinion as to the time the sun and moon stood still in ch. lxxxviii. 64, therefore it must be younger than the Talmud. This book does not contain the ode referred to in Josh. x. 13, but only the *words quoted from it in that passage*. This book is full of absurdities, and inconsistencies, and impossibilities, not to mention the numerous passages in which it contradicts itself in good set speech. We will venture at random to draw a few straws out of this rick, only premising that those we take are but a fair sample of the uncounted number left behind. Cain is made to *plough* the ground; he kills Abel with the *iron part* of his plough, for they had quarrelled, it seems, because "they were straitened for room," and Abel had *trespassed* on Cain's estate. Both of these sons of the earth wore *woollen* garments. We had fancied the first races of men knew as little of *ploughs*, and *real estate*, and *iron*, and *woollen* jackets, as some of their descendants six thousand years later. Our author solves the exegetical puzzle of Enoch's translation, and relates even the manner in which it was effected. He rode off "on a great Horse" which "paced in the air," (ch. iii. 27, seq.) and eight hundred thousand men — for they were counted — accom-

panied him some distance on the Earth. Three hundred and forty years after the flood, six hundred thousand of the impious assembled to build the tower of Babel. If a man fell in that work, no one would look at him; but if a brick got broken, "they would all weep over it." The tower at length became so high, that a whole year was necessarily spent in carrying a hod of bricks from the bottom to the top. Lot's wife, after she was changed into a pillar of salt, afforded a "sweet morsel" for the oxen "who daily licked it up to the extremities of the feet, and in the morning it would spring forth afresh." Thus our author's lies proved his ignorance, no less than his falsehood; for a diligent antiquary should have known that the oxen in that neighborhood will not eat salt; and before indulging in the composition of the book of Jasher, it would have been well enough to ascertain, whether the Babylonians *burned* their bricks, and whether the term *Satan* was known to the Jews before the exile. Such straws show which way the stream runs.

Miracles occur at every turn, like enchantments in the old romancers. Monstrous animals appear in the likeness of men and beasts and Kephas, [?] and so refined are they, that they ride on asses. Scorpions and serpents hide from the face of Joseph as he is thrown into the pit; the camels lie down for fear of the Lord, and Rachel's ghost, like the king in Hamlet, speaks out of the ground to her son. The following pleasant adventure is related. Jacob, after the loss of Joseph, sends his sons to catch the wild beast that had devoured his son, that the beast may "show cause" why he injured "so sweet a youth." They bring back a living wolf, which Jacob "with a bitter heart" addresses, "why didst thou devour my son Joseph, and how didst thou have no fear of the God of the earth?" &c. Mr. Wolf nothing daunted answers like any Jew, in good set phrase, "As God liveth who created us in the earth, and as thy soul liveth, I did not see thy son. I came into the field to seek my son, and your sons found me and seized me. Do unto me as it may seem good in thy sight, but by the life of God who created me, I did not see thy son, neither has the flesh of man entered my mouth all the days of my life."

We pass over many profane and indecent passages, and advise such as *will* read the book to do the same. On a certain occasion giant Og took up a stone *twelve miles* in length, designing therewith to crush the whole camp of Israel, but an angel, for angels are plenty as black-berries in the book, — killed the giant himself with this very stone. Judah did once upon a time, shout so loud that "all Egypt quaked at the sound," and the "walls of Egypt to the land of Goshen fell in," and still more, — "Pharaoh also fell from his throne."

The art of writing is made coeval with the human race, and we have an original letter from Jacob "to the powerful and wise king, the revealer of secrets, king of Egypt." Our author has an exceedingly felicitous knack of avoiding the unities of time and place; now his geography would lead us to the earth; then it sinks us in the palpable obscure of his own fancy. He relates an event which he says occurred "in the 91st year of the life of Abram," that is, about 1905, B. C., which is the well known rape of the Sabine women by the Romans, B. C. 750. He even makes use of the names Canopia, Tuscanah, the river Tibreu, and the city Sabinah. We thought human impudence could go no farther, but were mistaken; for turning to the preface, we find an attempt to vindicate this statement, and to show "that it was an event placed in proper chronological order." Turnus, Lucus, Romah, Bartoniah, Franca, the rivers Senah [Seine], Dubnee [Danube], and Tibreu [Tiber], are beautifully appropriate in the mouth of a contemporary of Moses. Still more remarkable is that chronology which makes Moses, Latus, and Hannibal live in the same age.

This book contains a brief account of the second Punic war, (ch. lxxiv.) and Hannibal's invasion of Italy. The Romans under the name of *Chittim* often appear in the book. One of the chapters relates events that took place "in the 72d year from the Israelites going down into Egypt," which it is plain could not have occurred until after the middle of the sixth century after Christ, for he speaks of the king of Bibentu [Benevento]. Now every body knows that there was no king, or duke, of Benevento, until the Lombards invaded Italy. But to expose his ignorance still more, this author has been left to mention the Lombards by name, and not by their more ancient title *Langebardi* or *Longobardi*, but by their more modern appellation *Lumbardi*. (ch. x. 15.)

The names of Jania, Niblos, Zepho, Sardunia, (where we suggest to the translator to read in the second syllable a *yod* instead of *vaw*,) Abianus, Brittainia, and Kernania, (as the translator misreads the Hebrew,) sound very natural in a Jew's mouth 1500 B. C. Still further, the Moorish invasion and conquest of Spain are distinctly set forth (in ch. l.) and referred to the times of Joseph, who himself led these Ishmaelites against the men of Tarshish [Spain]. From v. 5, it appears the Moors held possession at the time the book was written. The mention of Sevilla in the "Printer's preface" alone would throw suspicion on the book, for it is notorious that this town, — anciently called *Hispalis* or *Hispalia*, — did not receive its present title

until after the Moorish conquest, when the Arabic name, Ixbilla, became corrupted by the Castilians to its present form Sevilla. This reference, in v. 5, is perhaps the most certain mark of the author's age, though the obscure, and only conjectural allusion to Louis xi. (ch. lxxvi. 29, seq.) ought not perhaps to be overlooked. The alleged purity of the Hebrew, however, would place it at an earlier date; perhaps in the eleventh or twelfth century A. C.

It was scarcely necessary to say so much, to prove the spuriousness and worthlessness of this book, nor should we have written a word, had not some popular periodicals extolled it somewhat highly. It really contains a couple of fine moral passages, in the ninth and eleventh chapters; but these excepted, we remember nothing in the book worth reading. Sometimes the author or his translator gives us *very remarkable* etymologies, and the latter now and then indulges us with *learned* notes, which certainly display a very *unusual acquaintance* with the Hebrew tongue, that would have made Buxtorf and Gesenius "*stare and gasp*." We will not cumber our pages with examples, and bring up the "terrible Hebrew itself," but refer our readers to the notes on ch. xi. 4; xiv. 16; xlii. 34, and xliv. 18. In ch. lvi. 9, Jacob says "*teach thy sons the bow and all weapons of war*," and alluding obviously to 2 Sam. i. 18; but *there* a reference is made to a *song* called "The Bow," though our translators made the same mistake with this author, — but alas, the song nowhere appears in the book, which ends with the times of Joshua, and yet the translator appeals to this passage as "going far to prove the authenticity of the book"! p. xiv.

If we are rightly informed, the first edition of *this* Book of Jasher in Hebrew, commonly known, was published at Venice, 1625, 4to. Bartolucci (Bibliotheca magna Rabbinica sub voce) mentions an earlier edition, printed at Naples, but he is probably mistaken, for the Venice editor claims to be the first, and the Jewish doctors forbid any other person to issue the book for ten years to come. But Mr. Noah says the edition in his hands was printed at Venice, 1613. The edition of 1625 was reprinted at Cracow, 1628, 4to., at Frankfort, 1706, 8vo., and at Amsterdam, 1707. 8vo. It has also been translated, and published in German Jewish, and, if we mistake not, in mere German also. For farther information on this point we will refer our readers to Wolf's Treatise *de Scriptis Hæbræorum anonymis*, with its *Supplementa* in his *Bibliotheca Hæbræa*, voll. ii. and iii. sub voce; to his treatise *de libris in codice Hæbræo citatis sed non exstantibus*, in his *Bibliotheca*, and especially to vol. ii. p. 219, seq., where may be seen the various opinions

of scholars respecting the work referred to in Joshua and Samuel. See also Bartolucci, l. c. Pars. iii. Tom. iii. pp. 935 and 868.*

The present work is not the only "Book of Jasher." There is one with that title by Rabbi Tam, published at Cracow, 1586, which relates to the Jewish laws, as we are told, and is quoted by Eisenmeuger in his *entdecktes Judenthum*.

Another spurious "Book of Jasher" with a very long title, is now lying before us. It was printed at Bristol in 1829, 4to., (pp. xiv. 64, and 10,) and pretends to have been "translated into English by Alcuin," who lived in the eighth and ninth century, and knew as much of ancient Hebrew, as of modern English into which the translation is made. See this stupid forgery exposed by Mr. Horne in his Introduction to the Holy Scriptures, American ed., Phil., 1836, from the seventh London edition, vol. ii., Bibliographical Appendix, pp. 63, seq.

Critical and Miscellaneous Essays, by T. BABINGTON MACAULAY. 2 vols. 8vo. Boston: Weeks, Jordan, & Co. 1840. — We have been waiting with much interest for the appearance of these volumes, ever since the Publishers issued their proposals for giving them to the public. They contain sixteen articles from different numbers of the Edinburgh Review, written by the author in as many years. As they originally appeared in the Scotch Journal, they did more for its wide renown and circulation than any other series of articles which it has given to the world. They discuss high themes, and compress into pages, which may be comfortably perused in one interval of leisure, complete and philosophical delineations of many most distinguished men. Milton, Machiavelli, Dryden, Byron, Bunyan, Johnson, Hampden, Lord Burghley, Mirabeau, and Lord Bacon, are the subjects of some of the papers which excited the most interest at their successive appearance. The results of profound thought and of a wide field of study are here presented, without a word or idea which is above the comprehension of any intelligent reader. A high moral feeling, a superiority to common sectarian and party prejudices, and a discriminating acuteness of judgement, are the prominent characteristics of the author in his writings. The volumes did not

* Besides this, there is a treatise on the Book of Jasher by Abichtius, with the title *de Libro Recti*. Lipsiæ. 1714. 8vo., but we have not seen it. See also Carpzovius' *Introductio ad libros canonicos V. T.* Lips. 1731. 4to. P. I. p. 56, seq.

appear in season to admit of a thorough Review in our pages, and we must be satisfied with this brief notice, which may inform those who have already admired the single articles, that they are now to be found together, and induce those who have never read them to purchase for themselves cheap, but solid and pleasant wisdom.

The Scriptural Doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, in their relation to God the Father. By NATHANIEL S. FOLSOM. Boston: James Munroe & Company. 12mo. pp. 80. — A pamphlet of unusual interest; — not only for its contents, but for the circumstances which have called it forth. We solicit attention to it accordingly. The author, it appears, was recently the pastor of an Orthodox church in Providence, from which place he has withdrawn himself on account of a change of his views on the subject of the Trinity. This is the occasion of the publication before us. It begins with an Introduction, which contains the letter in which the author communicated to his church the reasons for resigning his office, and the considerations which have led him to make the present publication.

“During the last eight months, my doubts have thronged thick and fast. I determined to investigate the subject; and it was on this last week that I closed it. I now find myself in the confirmed rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity, as maintained in your creed, and all Orthodox creeds. As an honest man, I cannot continue your pastor, when I know I have come to entertain a sentiment subversive of what both you, and the ministry who set me over you, deem an essential article of Christian faith. Not that I have any scruples, myself, to preach to those who differ from me as you and all other Trinitarian Christians now differ. But knowing the established feelings on this point, it is my duty to retire, when I cannot stand with you on what I know you deem the only sure platform; and when I cannot lead you in forms of devotion dearly cherished in your hearts; and when, added to this, my conscience would rebuke me for appearing to be what I am not. These are the reasons, and the sole reasons, *why I leave now*. And my health is in truth a reason which urges me to leave, as early as practicable, this arduous field.

“I cannot conclude without saying, that I am solicitous to share still in your respect and affections. If you think I ought to have retired before this, — before my doubts assumed their present shape, — I can only reply that I tried to resist them; that I struggled hard to keep from entertaining them, and supposed I still might be free; while I also thought, (and still think,) of the possible injury that might be occasioned at least to some, by changing my opinion on a subject which is now connected, in the estimation of so many, with Christianity itself.

“And now once and to me still dear brethren, having apprized you

of the change in my views as soon as I have found it to have actually taken place, I beseech you follow me no farther than I have followed Christ. What I believe is not your standard. What I reject is not your rule. To his own Master every one standeth or falleth. Let the Bible be to each and to all, (what I trust I still hold it,) the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice. Unless the truth I cherish makes me, through the holy Spirit, meet for heaven; unless there is enough in my creed to prove God's power and wisdom to my salvation, I know I shall not be able to enter the kingdom and church of God above. I am fallible. If I have erred from 'the faith once delivered to the saints,' I ask your prayers that I may yet be saved, though it be 'as by fire.'" — pp. 3, 4.

Then follow several sections, in which are set forth the views respecting Christ and the Holy Spirit, in which his mind at present finds rest. They are expressed principally in the exposition of the various texts which have been regarded as most favorable to the Trinitarian hypothesis, and have the merit of great clearness, simplicity, and fairness, though not in all instances wholly satisfactory. Some of them seem to us particularly happy, and throw new light on the text; some are too brief; to some there seem to be obvious objections. The *tone* of the book is calm, fervent, serious, and gentle, as such writings should be, but too often are not. The allusions of the author to himself and his peculiar position are simple and modest, and such as to give a peculiar grace to the introductory chapter.

Such a pamphlet as this, from such a source, at the present day, gives occasion to a flood of reflections, which, if we had room, we should be tempted to bestow upon our readers. Perhaps it is as well that we are obliged to break off, and substitute for them the following extract.

"'Coming events cast their shadows before.' Many behold the signs of the times, and, in their dread, are entrenching themselves still farther back within the lines and circumvallations of doctrines of the sternest school, and have already built so high as to shut out not only their enemies, but half of their own army. A Stuart, who charged fundamental error on a Channing, receives in turn the same from a Dana. A Beecher, whose voice imperatively called for dismemberment of the heretical churches, and exclusion of the heretical ministers, has the same measure meted out to him by his brethren, and now stands himself, with hundreds of excluded ministers and dismembered churches. All this is preparing those in whose minds Christianity is not a mere name, but a living power, to welcome a transition to a state of more perfect freedom, and Christian forbearance, and brotherly love, and coöperation in the cause of religion and humanity." — pp. 12, 13.

NEW AND RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

A Discourse on the Life and Character of the Honorable Thomas Lee. By Samuel Gilman, D. D., Charleston, S. C.

The Unitarian Church in Charleston have met with no common bereavement in the death of Judge Lee. His character and services are beautifully commemorated in the discourse of Mr. Gilman. He was one of those men of whom society furnishes so few, who superior to fear and the prejudices of the community, thought, acted, and believed for himself in the matter of religion. Educated a Trinitarian, he yet reasoned out for himself the truth of the opposite system of faith, and what his inquiries taught him was true, that he hesitated not openly to avow, and forsaking the communion and church of his fathers, join himself to the Unitarians. Judge Lee was born in Charleston, in 1769. In 1794, he was appointed Solicitor-general of the State, and ten years afterward a Judge of the Court of Common Pleas. He was next made Comptroller-general of the State. In 1817 he was elected President of the State Bank in Charleston, an office which he held with honor for twenty-two years, and in 1823 was selected by Mr. Munroe to fill the place of Judge of the District Court for the South Carolina District. The two last offices he held at the time of his death. At a public meeting of the Tract Society of Mr. Gilman's Church, a few years since, he bore this testimony to his faith as a Unitarian Christian. "The creed of my fathers was Trinitarian; and I had every motive to attach myself to and love that religion which they professed. I was brought up in that faith, and worshipped in it long after the period of manhood. I then found its mysteries perplexing and incomprehensible. The demands which it made upon my mind to yield implicitly and blindly to doctrines, as fundamental, which I could not understand, led me to calm and deliberate investigation, which resulted in their rejection as not warranted by Scripture. I considered myself as an accountable being; and believing that it was my sacred duty to use the reasoning faculties, with which God has endowed me for the discovery of truth, and in a more especial manner of religious truth, I rejected the authority of men and councils, and sought for light and direction where alone they could be found, in the records of Revelation. My mind is completely satisfied, and I thank God I have no longer any doubts or misgivings."

An Address delivered before the New England Society in the city of New York, Dec. 23, 1839. By Robert C. Winthrop.

For the sake of the literary intelligence contained therein, we copy a note appended to this really eloquent address. "For the opportunity," says Mr. Winthrop, "of perusing this dialogue," an imaginary dialogue between some Young Men born in New England, and sundry Ancient Men that came out of Holland and Old England, written in 1648 by Governor Bradford, "I am indebted to Rev. Alexander Young, by whom it was copied from the Plymouth Church Records. I am happy to be able

to add, that Mr. Young is engaged in preparing for the press a volume, to be entitled 'The Old Chronicles of the Plymouth Colony, collected partly from original records and unpublished manuscripts, and partly from scarce tracts, hitherto unknown in this Country,' in which this Dialogue will be contained, and which will be, in fact, a history of the Plymouth People, written by themselves, from 1602 to 1624. Mr. Young confidently expects to be able to recover or restore the most valuable portion of Gov. Bradford's History, which was used by Prince and Hutchinson, but which disappeared during the War of the Revolution, and has been supposed to be irrecoverably lost."

A Discourse preached at the Dedication of the Suffolk Street Chapel, Feb. 5, 1840. By John T. Sargent; Pastor of the Chapel. Published by request. Boston. 1840.

On Natural Theology as a study in Schools. A Lecture delivered before the American Institute of Instruction, at its annual Session, holden in Springfield, August, 1839. By Henry A. Miles, of Lowell. Boston. 1840.

This is a most excellent discourse, plainly and strongly written, and containing, as we judge, sound doctrine on the subject of which the author treats. Its aim is to recommend the study of Natural Theology to the young generally, and in particular its adoption as a branch of instruction in our common schools. We lament with Mr. Miles, that Religion should be wholly banished from our schools. The reason indeed is not without foundation, namely a fear on the part of the community of sectarian indoctrination. But surely there are truths common to all Christian believers, which may be taught without offence to any conscience. Mr. Miles says, "To exclude the dogmas and prejudices of a sect, it is not necessary to exclude religion itself. The truths of Natural Theology are wholly independent of all questions of ecclesiastical strife. They relate, exclusively, to the existence and attributes of God, and are held in common by all of every name. Nor will it do to say that the Pulpit, and the Sunday School, should be the sole agents for teaching these truths. Here is the very evil against which we protest — that religious instruction is not made a part of the common, daily business of education, that it is pushed altogether aside to one or two hours on the Sabbath, that hence it becomes appropriated and formal, and that thus while the mere knowing faculties of the child are drilled continually, the higher and guiding powers of his soul are left stunted and dwarfed. How obvious is it that these never can have that proportion of culture — which, if the object of education be to perfect the whole man, is properly theirs, until we admit their right to have at least an equal chance of attention, and some enlightened, and careful, and thorough means of training them are employed, in the course of the every day processes of school education." But the practical difficulty — the laboring point, would be, we suppose, with the conscience of some zealous teachers, who would not consider themselves faithful to their own souls, and the souls of their pupils, if they forbore to enforce the peculiarities of their creed; and it is the peculiarities of a creed which, with those who hold it, are the vital and saving parts.

A Discourse on the Latest Form of Infidelity, delivered at the request of the "Association of the Alumni of the Cambridge School," on the 19th of July, 1839. With Notes. By Andrews Norton. Cambridge: J. Owen. 1839.

The Latest Form of Infidelity examined. A Letter to Mr. Andrews Norton, occasioned by his Discourse before the "Association of the Alumni of the Divinity School," on the 19th of July, 1839. By an Alumnus of that School. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1839.

Remarks on a Pamphlet entitled "The Latest Form of Infidelity examined." By Andrews Norton. Cambridge: J. Owen. 1839.

Second Letter to Mr. Andrews Norton, occasioned by his defence of a Discourse on the "Latest Form of Infidelity." By George Ripley. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1840.

Defence of the Latest Form of Infidelity examined. A third Letter to Mr. Andrews Norton, occasioned by his Discourse on the Latest Form of Infidelity. By George Ripley. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1840.

Transcendentalism of the Germans and of Cousin. Two Articles from the Princeton Review concerning the Transcendentalism of the Germans and of Cousin, and its influence on opinion in this country. Cambridge: J. Owen. 1840.

The previous Question between Mr. Andrews Norton and his Alumni moved and handled in a Letter to all those Gentlemen. By Levi Blodgett.

This is a pamphlet in the present spirit of the times. We do not say that it is the aim of the author, but it is the effect of what he has written, to reduce Christianity to the level of natural religion. His object in the first place is, to prove that there are germs of religion in the soul, that religion is natural to man, that man everywhere wants it and everywhere therefore has it, a case which he fully makes out, but which did not need special proof, as we suppose it to be a proposition as universally admitted, as that man needs and will therefore find food. When men agree to reject food or take poisonous substances in its stead, they will reject religion and be atheists. As some have been mad enough to do both these unnatural things, so there are monsters who have denied the being of a God. But they are and will be very few. We have no fears for religion, whatever we may sometimes have for revelation.

But if religion is natural to man—Mr. Blodgett then would have the inference to be drawn—Christianity is not a supernatural religion; seeing it was not needed as such. He does not deny that miracles were wrought; on the contrary he admits their reality, though he does

deny that it can be shown that they were. But as he leaves no office for them to perform of any use or dignity, he takes away every sufficient reason for believing that they were wrought. For if their only purpose was to make men wonder, or if they were only a sign of peculiar natural gifts or genius on the part of the worker, if no higher end can be assigned which they were to answer, the presumption against their actual occurrence becomes almost or quite insuperable. It is the end for which Christians suppose them to have been wrought, namely, to prove the divine mission and inspiration of Jesus, not to prove certain moral truths, as Mr. Blodgett thinks, which makes a belief in them reasonable and easy. It is hardly conceivable that one should long continue to admit the reality of miracles as facts—except through the mere force of habit—who does not see them in the character of proofs—proofs of Christ's authority. Christianity accordingly is in the view of this writer only one of the forms, in which men arrive at religion by their own unassisted genius. Geniuses arise from time to time, who carry on to a higher point science, and art, and philosophy, and so geniuses arise from time to time, who in the same way carry on religion farther and higher. Jesus was such an one. If he wrought miracles, it cannot be known historically that he wrought them, and they served no purpose that we can understand. Still he carried on Religion to a higher point by his divine instructions and his godlike virtues. The latter part of the pamphlet is taken up with specific considerations to show the incompetency of miracles as evidence; that they are not needed and are of no use; and the all-sufficiency of other kinds of proof. We cannot notice these considerations, but refer the reader to the pamphlet itself, if he is curious in such speculations.

We think such a tract as the one we are noticing injurious to Christianity, so far as its conclusions shall be adopted. Just so far, it appears to us, as the miracles of the New Testament are made out to be myths, fables, exaggerations of natural circumstances and events, the results of mistaken observation on the part of the evangelists, or anything else but what on the face of the thing they claim to be, just so far is the New Testament shown to be comparatively a worthless book; it is of no more value—except as it is a better book of the kind—than any philosophy or fiction which presents to the imagination and the reason excellent characters and doctrine. If now any should ask whether we really think it is for, or through the miracles most persons believe Christianity, we say no. They do not think much about them one way or another, in becoming Christians. It is the moral and spiritual character of Christ and his teaching, that makes them Christians, so far as the New Testament has any share, in addition to education and circumstances, in making them so. But then, but for the miracles, we contend there would have been no Christ, no Christianity. Mr. Blodgett says he deprecates the theology of those who rest Christianity solely, or chiefly on miracles, and thinks them its true enemies. We in our turn deprecate such a theology as this pamphlet presents, for we are sure it could not be extensively adopted, but at the expense of all that to us is most valuable in Christianity. We had natural religion before Christ came; it is to be had now in Africa and the islands of the Pacific. We value Christianity on the ground, that it is

something additional to that — and so far better, namely, a revelation — using the word in its common acceptation. But however mistaken we may hold the theology of the pamphlet, we acknowledge with satisfaction the earnest and religious spirit in which it is written.

Two Discourses preached before the First Congregational Society in Medford; one upon leaving the Old Church; and one at the Dedication of the New. By Caleb Stetson; Minister of the Society. Boston: 1840.

The Preacher and the Pastor. Two Discourses delivered in Harvard Church, Charlestown, Sunday, March 15, 1840, on the Commencement of his Ministry. By George E. Ellis. Printed by request, for the use of the Society. Boston: 1840.

The Analyst: a Collection of Miscellaneous Pieces. New York: Wiley and Putnam.

This is the play-day work of a man of elegant tastes, and of much good reading. He produces his wares, however, in so many different forms, copied after chosen models, that it is not easy to obtain a distinct idea of his own manner. The volume consists of essays, criticisms, imitations, philosophical speculations, characters, sketches, letters, and fragments, presenting together an agreeable and various repast, to serve as a dessert after the severer studies of the closet. We would gladly bestow upon them a more equal notice, accompanied by extracts, but it is not easy to find the room we want for the merely literary. We think, by the way, that he abuses the clergy quite too much; at least his pictures are not true of that order in this part of the country. We do not know which of the sects sat to him for its portrait. — To sell, the book should have received a more imposing form from the printer. All but great geniuses must be content to owe half their honors and successes to paper, type, and press-work.

On Labor. An Address at the Annual Cattle Shows of the Worcester, Hampshire, Hampden, and Franklin Agricultural Societies, October, 1838. By H. Colman. Boston: 1839.

An Address to the Middlesex Society of Husbandmen and Manufacturers, at their Annual Cattle Show. By Henry Colman; Commissioner for the Agricultural Survey of the State. Boston: 1839.

Spartacus, or the Roman Gladiator; a Tragedy, in five acts, by Jacob Jones, Esq., Author of "Longinus, a Tragedy," &c. Third Edition. London: 1837.

The Cathedral Bell; a Tragedy, in five acts. By Jacob Jones, Barrister at Law; Author of the "Stepmother"; "Longinus, or the Fall of Palmyra," &c. London: 1839.

Cabiro; A Poem, by George H. Calvert, Author of "Count

Julian, a Tragedy," and Translator of Schiller's *Don Carlos*. Cantos I. and II. Baltimore: 1840.

There are many signs of a bold and poetical mind in *Count Julian*, the title of which we gave in our last number. If the author is, as we take him to be, a young man, or a young author, he may do very considerable things yet. In this tragedy he has given a gratifying evidence of courage and of conscious resources, in adopting a fable of extreme simplicity, and throwing himself for success upon his power to unfold character, and speak through noble and interesting sentiment to the heart of the reader. We are obliged to confess, that the words are sometimes more than the idea; the thought is dressed in too cumbersome and startling drapery. The language of particular passages, as well as the general strain of some of the scenes and dialogues, is perhaps a little too much in "Hercules' vein." But in saying this we acknowledge the presence of a reflecting, vigorous, poetical mind. Of *Cabiro* we have little to say in commendation. There are good lines and stanzas,—but it requires more than the genius of even Byron to make such poetry very readable. *Beppo* and *Don Juan* are enough of the kind.

Unitarian Christianity, — What it is, and what it is not. A Discourse delivered at the Installation of the Rev. John Parkman, as Pastor of the First Unitarian Church and Society in Dover, N. H. April 22, 1840. By Ezra S. Gannett, Junior Pastor of the Federal Street Church, Boston. With the Charge, by Rev. John Pierpont; the Right Hand, by Rev. Samuel Osgood; Address to the People, by Rev. Francis Parkman, D. D.

Two Discourses, delivered September 29, 1839, on occasion of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Gathering of the First Congregational Church, Quincy: with an Appendix. By William P. Lunt. Boston: 1840.

A Discourse delivered in the Church in Brattle Square, on Sunday, May 3, 1840; occasioned by the death of Rev. John Thornton Kirkland, D. D., LL. D., late of Harvard University. By Francis Parkman, D. D., Pastor of the New North Church. Boston: 1840.

A Discourse on the Life and Character of the Rev. John Thornton Kirkland, D. D., LL. D., formerly Pastor of the Church on Church Green, Boston, also late President of Harvard University, delivered in the Church on Church Green, May 3, 1840. By Alexander Young. Boston: 1840.

A Letter to Rev. Ezra S. Gannett of Boston, occasioned by his Tract on the Atonement. By Nehemiah Adams, Pastor of Essex Street Church, Boston. Boston: James Munroe and Co 1840.

A Discourse on the Life and Character of the Rev. Charles Follen, LL. D., who perished January 13, 1840, in the conflagration of the Lexington. Delivered before the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, in the Marlborough Chapel, Boston, April 17, 1840. By Samuel J. May.

Poems, by William Thompson Bacon. Third Edition. Boston : Weeks, Jordan, and Co. 1840.

The Bible Reader ; being a new Selection of Reading Lessons from the Holy Scriptures, for the use of families. By W. B. Fowle, Author of the Primary Reader. Boston : 1839.

Mr. Fowle thus states his design in making these selections, which it seems to us he has accomplished very successfully. "The author of the compilation has endeavored to furnish such a selection of Scripture Lessons as may be used in schools and families, without subjecting the teacher or the reader to the trouble of making a selection at the time of reading. That some selection was called for, no one will deny, who has attempted to read the Bible in course to his pupils or to his family." Those very familiar with the Scriptures might prefer to make their own selections for morning and evening service, but by others this volume would be, we think, a very convenient manual. "The text of the common translation has been followed." "In a few cases the pronunciation of difficult words is marked. The work is divided into three parts, the first containing selections from the Old Testament, the second such miscellaneous passages as most fairly exhibit the precepts of Religion, arranged under suitable heads."

The Chapel Hymn Book. Third Edition ; with additional Hymns. Boston : 1839.

A small, neat pocket volume of 288 pages and 437 Hymns. "Simplicity and cheapness," say Messrs. Barnard and Gray, "were our objects in compiling it." "It is offered to the public," having been prepared originally for the Warren and Pitts Street Chapels, "at the request of certain of our friends, who think it may be acceptable in Sunday Schools, Families, or some of our smaller Churches."

Academical Lectures on the Hebrew Scriptures and Antiquities. By John Gorham Palfrey, D. D., LL. D. Vol. II. Genesis and Prophets. Boston : James Munroe and Co.

Theory of Legislation ; by Jeremy Bentham. Translated from the French of Etienne Dumont, by R. Hildreth, Author of "Banks, and Banking, and Paper Currencies," "Despotism in America," "Archy Moore," &c. Vol. I. Principles of Legislation. Boston : Weeks, Jordan, and Co. 1840. 2 vols.

INDEX.

A.

Aimé Martin on the education of Mothers, reviewed, 44. — Three systems of education described. The old fashioned, 44 — the modern, 45 — the masculine, 51 — Eclectic, 52. — Aimé Martin's work analyzed with quotations, 53-63.

Analyst, the, a collection of miscellaneous pieces, 402.

Antiquities, Christian, in Rome, 335, 339.

Atonement, Magee on, reviewed, 63.

B.

Bardesanes, an early writer of hymns, 11.

Beard on Owenism, noticed, 255.

Bible Reader, the, 404.

Blind, principles of the instruction of the, 262.

Blodgett, Levi, on the previous question between Mr. Andrews Norton and his Alumni, 400.

Board of Education, third annual report of, noticed, 253.

Bowring's account of the present state of the Samaritans, 150, note.

Brownson, O. A., his Charles Elwood, or the Infidel Converted, reviewed, 180.

C.

Cabiro, a Poem, by George H. Calvert, 403.

Cellerier's Authenticity of the New Testament, 268,

Chandler's Hymns of the Primitive Church, reviewed, 1.

Channing, Rev. W. E., Discourse of, occasioned by the death of Dr. Follen, 68-87.

Channing, W. H.; his Translation of Jouffroy's Introduction to Ethics, reviewed, 137 — an analysis of the work, 138-147 — Reasons why such a work is important, 144 — Want of a true system of Christian Ethics, 146.

Charles Elwood, or the Infidel Converted, reviewed, 180.

Chapel Hymn Book, 404.

Chicago, Annals of, by J. R. Bales-tier, 269.

Christian Antiquities in Rome, 325-339.

Christianity, historical, article on, 166.

Christian Layman, the, reviewed, 122.

Crania Americana; or a comparative view of the skulls of various Aboriginal nations of North and South America, by Samuel George Morton, reviewed, 248.

D.

Daubigné's History of the Reformation, 20 — Account of the author and general character of his work, 21 — An analysis given of it, 22-44.

Dean's Philosophy of Human Life, 263.

Delusion; or the Witch of New England, 130.
 Despotism in America, 271.
 Domestic Worship, by W. H. Furness, reviewed, 199.
 Dudleian Lecture, by Rev. W. B. O. Peabody, 317-325.

E.

Education of Mothers, by L. Aimé Martin, reviewed, 44.
 Elwood, Charles, or the Infidel Converted, reviewed, 180.
 Ephrem, the Syrian, a voluminous writer of hymns, 11.
 Evil, its true office and end, a Discourse by Dr. Channing, 68-78.

F.

Faerie Queene, Spenser's, reviewed, 208.
 Follen, Rev. Charles, Discourse occasioned by the death of, 68 — Sketch of the Life of, 87, 88.
 Folsom's, Nathaniel S., Scriptural Doctrine of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, noticed, 396.
 Footsteps of Angels, Longfellow's, quoted, 247.
 Fowle's Bible Reader, 404.
 Frithiof's Saga; or Legend of Frithiof. By Esaias Tegner, reviewed, 339-358.
 France, education in, 47-50.
 Furness, W. H., his "Domestic Worship," reviewed, 199.

G.

Gammer Grethel, by Mrs. Follen, noticed, 267.
 German Literary Intelligence, 135.
 Gilman's, Rev. Samuel, Discourse on the life and character of the Honorable Thomas Lee, 398.

H.

Historical Christianity, a defence of 166-171.
 Hymns of the Primitive Church, article on, 1 — Chandler's col-

lection, 1-3 — Bishop Mants, 4-7 — Ancient mode of singing in the churches, 8 — Ambrose, 16 — Improvements introduced by Gregory, 9 — Ancient writers of hymns, 10 — Bardesanes, Ephrem, &c., 11 — Paul of Samosata, Prudentius, &c., 13-19.

I.

Infidelity, Modern, characteristics and causes of, 181-186.

J.

Jesus, life of, by Strauss, reviewed, 273-316.
 Jouffroy's Introduction to Ethics, translated by W. H. Channing, reviewed, 137.
 Julian, Count, a tragedy, 403.

L.

Laura Bridgman, an account of, 367-375.
 Layman, the Christian, reviewed, 122.
 Lee, Thomas, a Discourse on the life and character of, by Rev. Samuel Gilman, 398.
 Life of Jesus, by Strauss, reviewed, 273-316.
 Local Vestiges of the early propagation of Christianity in the city of Rome, 325-339.
 Longfellow's Voices of the Night, reviewed, 242.
 Lothrop, S. K., Sermon by, on the destruction of the Lexington, noticed, 130.
 Luther, sketch of the life of, from Daubigné's history of the Reformation, 22-44.

M.

Macaulay, T. Babington, Critical and Miscellaneous Essays by, noticed, 395.
 Magee on the Atonement, reviewed, 63.
 Mants' Ancient Hymns, reviewed, 1.

- Martin, Aimé, on the education of mothers, reviewed, 44.
 Massachusetts Board of Education, third annual report of, noticed, 253.
 Miles, Henry A., on Natural Theology as a study in schools a Lecture by, 399.
 Miracles, Mr. Brownson's view of, 194 - 196.
 Moore, Archy; or Memoirs of a Slave, noticed, 129.
 Morin, Father, his theory of the Israelitish origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch defended, 159 - 165.
 Morton's *Crania Americana*, reviewed, 248.
 Music in the Ancient Christian Church, 7 - 9.

N.

- National Establishments of religion.
 By John Taylor, reviewed, 171.

O.

- Obligations of the world to the Bible, a series of lectures to young men, by Gardiner Spring, noticed, 261.
 Owenism, Christianity defended from the assaults of, by J. R. Beard, noticed, 255.

P.

- Palfrey, John Gorham, his Duddleian Lecture on the theory and uses of Natural Religion, noticed, 127.
 Peabody's, Rev. W. B. O., Duddleian Lecture, 317 - 325.
 Pebblebrook; or the Harding Family, 131.
 Pebbles from Castalia, noticed, 265.
 Pentateuch, Samaritan, article on, 147.
 Perkins Institution, and Massachusetts Asylum for the blind, eighth annual report of the trustees of, reviewed, 359 - 378.
 Philosophy of Human life, by Amos Dean, noticed, 263.
 Poet's Tribute, by W. B. Tappan, noticed, 128.
 Prayer, objections to, considered, 199 - 202 — the nature and value of prayer, 203 — the duty of family prayer urged, 205 - 207.
 Psalm of Life, Longfellow's quoted, 244.

R.

- Reformation, History of, by D'Aubigné, reviewed, 20.
 Rejected Addresses, 271.
 Rome, Christian Antiquities in, 325 - 339.
 Rosanna; or scenes in Boston, reviewed, 111.

S.

- Samaritan Pentateuch, 147 — History and present condition of the Samaritan people, 148 - 151 — The Samaritan Pentateuch known to the Fathers of the first centuries, 152 — Sketch of its History to the present time, 152 - 155 — Account of the controversy concerning its origin and character, 156 - 158 — Remarks on it, 158, 159 — Arguments in behalf of Father Morin's theory of the Israelitish origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch, 159 - 165.
 Scenes in Judea, 89 - 111, 224 - 241.
 Singing in the ancient churches, 7.
 Spenser's poetical works, reviewed, 208 — Characteristics of Spenser, and his poetry, 210 - 218 — Faults to be charged upon the Faerie Queene, 218 — Minor poems of Spenser, 219 — His rank as a poet, 220 — Compared with Shakspeare and Milton, 221 - 223.
 Spring's, Gardiner, Obligations of the world to the Bible, 261.
 Stephens, his visit to the Samaritans at Naplosa.
 Strauss's Life of Jesus, reviewed, 273 — not properly a life of Jesus, 274 — the introduction valuable to the student of the Scrip-

tures, 274 — an abstract given of it, 274 — 283 — Strauss's historical difficulties and objections, examples of, 283 — 305 — Concluding treatise of Strauss, 305 — false principles of Strauss pointed out, 307 — 312 — Concluding remarks, 313 — 316.

T.

Tappan, William B., his Poet's Tribute, noticed, 128.

Taylor on National Establishments of Religion, reviewed, 171.

Taylor, Isaac, his Ancient Christianity, and the Doctrines of the Oxford Tracts, noticed, 257.

Teacher taught, by Emerson Davis, noticed, 259.

Tegner's, Frithiof's Saga, or Legend of Frithiof, reviewed, 339 — 358.

Temperance Reform, 111 — Legislation, 114 — 121.

Thacher, William Vincent, obitu-

ary notice of, 131 — epitaph, 134.

Transcendentalism of the Germans and of Cousin, two articles from the Princeton Review, noticed, 400.

V.

Voices of the Night, by H. W. Longfellow, reviewed, 242.

Voluntaryism and its results compared with compulsory support of Religion, 178.

W.

White Slavery, 269.

Winthrop, Robert C., his address delivered before the New England Society in the city of New York, 398.

Withington's review of late temperance movements, 269.

Worship, Domestic, by W. H. Furness, reviewed, 199.

ERRATA. — Page 113, line 1, for *individually* read *individuals*.
 " 338, line 30, " *subjects* " *objects*.

On On

710
complete

No. 97.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
GENERAL REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES—No. XXVIII.

MARCH, 1840.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
I. HYMNS OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH	1	VII. THE TEMPERANCE REFORM	111
1. The Hymns of the Primitive Church; now first collected, translated, and arranged. By the Rev. J. CHANDLER.		Rosanna; or Scenes in Boston. A Story; by the Author of "Three Experiments of Living, &c."	
2. Ancient Hymns, from the Roman Breviary, for domestic Use. By RICHARD MANT.		VIII. THE CHRISTIAN LAYMAN. 123	
II. HISTORY OF THE D'AUBIGNÉ REFORMATION	20	The Christian Layman, or the Doctrine of the Trinity fully considered and adjudged according to the Bible. By A CHRISTIAN LAYMAN.	
History of the Great Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, in Germany, Switzerland, &c. By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNÉ.		NOTICES AND INTELLIGENCE.	
III. EDUCATION OF MOTHERS	44	The Theory and Uses of Natural Religion; being the Dudleyan Lecture. By JOHN G. PALFREY	127
De l'Education des Meres de Famille ou de la Cvilisation du Genre Humain par les Femmes. Par L. AIMÉ MARTIN.		The Poet's Tribute. By WILLIAM B. TAPPAN	128
IV. MAGEE ON ATONEMENT AND SACRIFICE	63	The Slave; or Memoirs of Archy Moore	129
Discourses and Dissertations on the Scriptural Doctrines of Atonement and Sacrifice, &c. By REV. WILLIAM MAGEE.		Delusion; or the Witch of New England	130
V. DISCOURSE ON THE DEATH OF DR. FOLLEN. BY WILLIAM E. CHANNING	68	A Sermon on the Destruction of the Lexington. By S. K. LOTHROP	130
VI. SCENES IN JUDEA	89	Pebblebrook, or the Harding Family	131
		WILLIAM V. THACHER	131
		LITERARY INTELLIGENCE	135

BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY.

LONDON:

WILEY AND PUTNAM, 67 PATERNOSTER ROW.

1840.

PROSPECTUS
OF THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

THE present number of the Examiner being the first of a new volume, the Editor makes use of the occasion to call the attention of its friends, and the friends of Unitarian Christianity generally, to its state. It needs, and must have, in order to its vigorous existence, a much larger number of subscribers than it can now boast of. The present list shows but a few over eight hundred names; and from a portion of these payment is doubtful, or long deferred, or is received in a depreciated currency. After deducting the cost of printing, the profits of the publisher, and the amount paid to contributors — being a dollar a page for all original and translated matter — but a very small sum is left as a remuneration for the labors and responsibility of editing. This must be very considerably increased to allow of as much time being exclusively devoted to the work as it may justly claim. A little effort on the part of clergymen and other influential individuals, it is confidently believed, would in a short time greatly enlarge the present list.

In aiming to extend the circulation of this long established journal — instituted by the late Dr. Worcester and conducted, since it passed from his hands in the year 1818, by a succession of sound scholars and learned divines — the Editor feels that he is doing a service to the best interests of literature and religion. No Review of our country has supplied articles of profounder learning, or a higher eloquence, or which have offered to those who read for any other end than mere amusement, a larger amount of instructive and valuable matter. A periodical which has given to the world such pieces as those upon Stuart's Letters to Dr. Channing, and his Commentary on the Hebrews, upon Milton, Fenelon, and Bonaparte, to name no more, has no reason to shrink from comparison with any other. With but few exceptions the names of its earlier contributors are still upon its catalogue with the addition of many others. The Editor believes he may assure the subscribers, that the work in its future numbers will not be less useful, or less honorable to the theological literature of the country than heretofore.

(See third page.)

In regard to the character and aim of the Examiner, no more need be done than to refer to the long series of its volumes, and say that such as it has been in purpose and tendency in time past, such will it be the endeavor of the Editor to make it in the future;—those changes only being introduced, but those freely, which the times shall seem to demand. There will be no slavish adherence to the old; but on the other hand no rash adoption of the new. It will continue to “examine” and discuss calmly and well, before it departs from what it has long held and revered as truth, and admits what is proposed as a substitute. Progress will be its motto and aim; but progress upon solid ground. It will be content to remain stationary no longer than till it can advance with security and into a growing light. A liberal conservatism appears to be the best praise that can be bestowed upon those, and such we claim to be, who are classed among reformers. Change is not necessarily reform.

In this connexion it is proper to state, that the Christian Examiner is under the general superintendence of the same association of gentlemen, who in 1829 revived it and gave to it its present form; a committee of whom constitutes a board of advice, to whom the Editor may at pleasure refer any question relative to the conduct of the work.

It is the wish of the Editor to enlarge the proportion of articles which shall be of a practical and spiritual character; which shall bear more directly upon the conduct and principles of daily life, which shall help and guide the mind of the reader to form a correct judgment upon those questions of opinion and action that are coming up every day for decision. He desires also, as far as may be compatible with the principal object of the Review, to render it not only useful to the theologian, but attractive and interesting to the general religious reader.

No effort will be spared to induce gentlemen of learning and talent in every part of the country to give their best thoughts to the pages of the Examiner.

It is intended in future numbers to devote a larger space to the notice of new publications, and, if warranted by an increased subscription, to add for this purpose to the size of each number.

Publishers of books in theology and general literature are informed that every volume sent to the office of the Examiner, and enclosed to the Editor, will receive at the earliest date possible, either a review, a notice, or be placed with its title at length on a list of new books.

The Christian Examiner is published once in two months, on the first day of March, May, July, September, November, and January, making six numbers of 136 pages each, or two volumes, of 408 pages each, for every year, at \$4 per annum, payable on the delivery of the second number; that is, on the first of May. All communications relating to subscriptions are to be addressed to “James Munroe & Co.,” all others to the “Editor of the Christian Examiner,” care of the same. Articles intended for insertion should be in the hands of the Editor two months before the day of publication of any given number.

W. WARE.

Cambridge, March 1, 1840.

THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY,
PUBLISHERS,

No. 134 Washington Street, Boston.

AGENTS.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

PORTSMOUTH, J. W. Foster.
EXETER, F. Grant.
DOVER, & } G. & E. Wadleigh.
GREAT FALLS, }
KEENE, George Tilden.
CONCORD, Marsh, Capen, & Lyon.

MASSACHUSETTS.

CAMBRIDGE, J. Owen.
CHARLESTOWN, G. W. Warren.
CONCORD, J. Stacy.
TAUNTON, S. O. Dunbar.
SALEM, { Caleb Foote.
{ H. Whipple.
DANVERS, J. B. Pierce.
NEWBURYPORT, no. Gray, Jr.
HINGHAM, Moses L. Whitton.
NEW BEDFORD, William Howe.
NANTUCKET, George W. Ewer.
PLYMOUTH, W. S. Bartlett.
GREENFIELD, David Clark, Jr.
WORCESTER, C. Harris.
SPRINGFIELD, Samuel Bowles.
NORTHAMPTON, J. H. Butler.
LOWELL, Oliver March.
AMHERST, J. S. & C. Adams.

MAINE.

PORTLAND, Colman & Chisholm.
HALLOWELL, C. Spaulding.
BELFAST, E. T. Morrill.
AUGUSTA, G. S. Carpenter & Co.
BANGOR, Smith & Fenno.
EASTPORT, J. Beckford.

RHODE ISLAND.

PROVIDENCE, B. Cranston & Co.

CONNECTICUT.

NEW HAVEN, Herrick & Noyes.
HARTFORD, Canfield & Robbins.

VERMONT.

BURLINGTON, V. Harrington.
BRATTLEBORO', Joseph Steen.

NEW JERSEY.

TRENTON, D. Fenton.

NEW YORK.

ALBANY, W. C. Little.
NEW YORK, C. S. Francis.
TRENTON, Isaac B. Pierce.
CANANDAIGUA, L. Morse.
AUBURN, Ivison & Terry.
BUFFALO, O. G. Steele.
ROCHESTER, C. Morse.
SYRACUSE, G. J. Gardner.

PENNSYLVANIA.

PHILADELPHIA, Jas. Kay, Jr., & Brother.
PITTSBURG, Kay & Co.

MARYLAND.

BALTIMORE, N. Hickman.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

WASHINGTON, Kennedy & Elliott.

VIRGINIA.

RICHMOND, R. D. Sanxay.
NORFOLK, C. Hall.

KENTUCKY.

LEXINGTON, C. Wallace.

OHIO.

CINCINNATI, Josiah Drake.
MARIETTA, N. Ward.

NORTH CAROLINA.

RALEIGH, J. Gales & Son.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

CHARLESTON, J. S. Burges.
COLUMBIA, B. D. Plant.

GEORGIA.

AUGUSTA, W. J. Hobby.
SAVANNAH, Thomas Purse.

ALABAMA.

MOBILE, Levi Fletcher.

TENNESSEE.

NASHVILLE, W. A. Eichbaum.
CHRISTIANVILLE, B. S. Parsons.

MISSISSIPPI.

NATCHEZ, N. L. Williams.

LOUISIANA.

NEW ORLEANS, E. Johns & Co.

☞ The work will be sent by mail to any part of the United States on the remittance of one year's subscription (four dollars) to the Publishers, Boston, or to any of the agents, — subscribers paying postage, and taking the risk of conveyance.

The subscription becomes due on the publication of the second number; that is, on the 1st of May. Distant subscribers are expected to transmit the amount of their yearly subscriptions as soon as they receive the second number of each year.

CAMBRIDGE PRESS: — METCALF, TORRY, AND BALLOU.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
GENERAL REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES — No. XXIX.

MAY, 1840.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
I. CHANNING'S TRANSLATION OF JOUFFROY'S INTRODUCTION TO ETHICS	137	The Faerie Queene, and Notes, by the Editor.	
Specimens of Foreign Standard Literature. Edited by GEORGE RIPLEY. Vols. V. and VI. Containing Introduction to Ethics, &c. By W. H. CHANNING.		VIII. SCENES IN JUDEA	224
II. THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH	147	IX. LONGFELLOW'S VOICES OF THE NIGHT	242
III. HISTORICAL CHRISTIANITY	166	X. CRANIA AMERICANA	248
IV. TAYLOR ON NATIONAL ESTABLISHMENTS OF RELIGION	171	Crania Americana; or, a Comparative View of the Skulls of Various Aboriginal Nations of North and South America, &c. By S. G. MORTON, M. D.	
National Establishments of Religion, considered in connexion with Justice, Christianity, and Human Nature. By JOHN TAYLOR.		CRITICAL NOTICES.	
V. CHARLES ELWOOD	180	Massachusetts Board of Education	253
Charles Elwood; or the Infidel Converted. By O. A. BROWN-SON.		The Religion of Jesus Christ defended from the assaults of Owenism	255
VI. DOMESTIC WORSHIP	199	Ancient Christianity and the Doctrines of the Oxford Tracts	257
Domestic Worship. By W. H. FURNESS.		The Teacher Taught; or the Principles and Modes of Teaching	259
VII. SPENSER'S POETICAL WORKS	208	The Obligations of the World to the Bible; a Series of Lectures to Young Men	261
The Poetical Works of EDMUND SPENSER. In 5 vols. First American Edition; with Introductory Observations on		Dean's Philosophy of Human Life	263
		Pebbles from Castalia	265
		Gammer Grethel	267
		NEW AND RECENT PUBLICATIONS	269

BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY.

LONDON:

JOHN GREEN, 121 NEWGATE STREET.

1840.

PROSPECTUS
OF THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

THE present number of the Examiner being the first of a new volume, the Editor makes use of the occasion to call the attention of its friends, and the friends of Unitarian Christianity generally, to its state. It needs, and must have, in order to its vigorous existence, a much larger number of subscribers than it can now boast of. The present list shows but a few over eight hundred names; and from a portion of these payment is doubtful, or long deferred, or is received in a depreciated currency. After deducting the cost of printing, the profits of the publisher, and the amount paid to contributors — being a dollar a page for all original and translated matter — but a very small sum is left as a remuneration for the labors and responsibility of editing. This must be very considerably increased to allow of as much time being exclusively devoted to the work as it may justly claim. A little effort on the part of clergymen and other influential individuals, it is confidently believed, would in a short time greatly enlarge the present list.

In aiming to extend the circulation of this long established journal — instituted by the late Dr. Worcester and conducted, since it passed from his hands in the year 1818, by a succession of sound scholars and learned divines — the Editor feels that he is doing a service to the best interests of literature and religion. No Review of our country has supplied articles of profounder learning, or a higher eloquence, or which have offered to those who read for any other end than mere amusement, a larger amount of instructive and valuable matter. A periodical which has given to the world such pieces as those upon Stuart's Letters to Dr. Channing, and his Commentary on the Hebrews, upon Milton, Fenelon, and Bonaparte, to name no more, has no reason to shrink from comparison with any other. With but few exceptions the names of its earlier contributors are still upon its catalogue with the addition of many others. The Editor believes he may assure the subscribers, that the work in its future numbers will not be less useful, or less honorable to the theological literature of the country than heretofore.

(See third page.)

In regard to the character and aim of the Examiner, no more need be done than to refer to the long series of its volumes, and say that such as it has been in purpose and tendency in time past, such will it be the endeavor of the Editor to make it in the future;—those changes only being introduced, but those freely, which the times shall seem to demand. There will be no slavish adherence to the old; but on the other hand no rash adoption of the new. It will continue to “examine” and discuss calmly and well, before it departs from what it has long held and revered as truth, and admits what is proposed as a substitute. Progress will be its motto and aim; but progress upon solid ground. It will be content to remain stationary no longer than till it can advance with security and into a growing light. A liberal conservatism appears to be the best praise that can be bestowed upon those, and such we claim to be, who are classed among reformers. Change is not necessarily reform.

In this connexion it is proper to state, that the Christian Examiner is under the general superintendence of the same association of gentlemen, who in 1829 revived it and gave to it its present form; a committee of whom constitutes a board of advice, to whom the Editor may at pleasure refer any question relative to the conduct of the work.

It is the wish of the Editor to enlarge the proportion of articles which shall be of a practical and spiritual character; which shall bear more directly upon the conduct and principles of daily life, which shall help and guide the mind of the reader to form a correct judgment upon those questions of opinion and action that are coming up every day for decision. He desires also, as far as may be compatible with the principal object of the Review, to render it not only useful to the theologian, but attractive and interesting to the general religious reader.

No effort will be spared to induce gentlemen of learning and talent in every part of the country to give their best thoughts to the pages of the Examiner.

It is intended in future numbers to devote a larger space to the notice of new publications, and, if warranted by an increased subscription, to add for this purpose to the size of each number.

Publishers of books in theology and general literature are informed that every volume sent to the office of the Examiner, and enclosed to the Editor, will receive at the earliest date possible, either a review, a notice, or be placed with its title at length on a list of new books.

The Christian Examiner is published once in two months, on the first day of March, May, July, September, November, and January, making six numbers of 136 pages each, or two volumes, of 408 pages each, for every year, at \$4 per annum, payable on the delivery of the second number; that is, on the first of May. All communications relating to subscriptions are to be addressed to “James Munroe & Co.,” all others to the “Editor of the Christian Examiner,” care of the same. Articles intended for insertion should be in the hands of the Editor two months before the day of publication of any given number.

W. WARE.

Cambridge, March 1, 1840.

THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY,
PUBLISHERS,
No. 134 Washington Street, Boston.

AGENTS.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.		NEW YORK.	
PORTSMOUTH,	J. W. Foster.	ALBANY,	W. C. Little.
EXETER,	F. Grant.	NEW YORK,	C. S. Francis.
DOVER, &	} G. & E. Wadleigh.	TRENTON,	Isaac B. Pierce.
GREAT FALLS,		CANANDAIGUA,	L. Morse.
KEENE,	George Tilden.	AUBURN,	Iverson & Terry.
CONCORD,	Marsh, Capen, & Lyon.	BUFFALO,	O. G. Steele.
MASSACHUSETTS.		ROCHESTER,	C. Morse.
CAMBRIDGE,	J. Owen.	SYRACUSE,	G. J. Gardner.
CHARLESTOWN,	G. W. Warren.	PENNSYLVANIA.	
CONCORD,	J. Stacy.	PHILADELPHIA,	Jas. Kay, Jr., & Brother.
TAUNTON,	S. O. Dunbar.	PITTSBURG,	Kay & Co.
SALEM,	{ Caleb Foote.	MARYLAND.	
	{ H. Whipple.	BALTIMORE,	N. Hickman.
DANVERS,	J. B. Pierce.	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.	
NEWBURYPORT,	J. O. Gray, Jr.	WASHINGTON,	Kennedy & Elliott.
HINGHAM,	Moses L. Whitton.	VIRGINIA.	
NEW BEDFORD,	William Howe.	RICHMOND,	R. D. Sanxay.
NANTUCKET,	George W. Ewer.	NORFOLK,	C. Hall.
PLYMOUTH,	W. S. Bartlett.	KENTUCKY.	
GREENFIELD,	David Clark, Jr.	LEXINGTON,	C. Wallace.
WORCESTER,	C. Harris.	OHIO.	
SPRINGFIELD,	Samuel Bowles.	CINCINNATI,	Josiah Drake.
NORTHAMPTON,	J. H. Butler.	MARIETTA,	N. Ward.
LOWELL,	Oliver March.	NORTH CAROLINA.	
AMHERST,	J. S. & C. Adams.	RALEIGH,	J. Gales & Son.
MAINE.		SOUTH CAROLINA.	
PORTLAND,	Colman & Chisholm.	CHARLESTON,	J. S. Burges.
HALLOWELL,	C. Spaulding.	COLUMBIA,	B. D. Plant.
BELFAST,	E. T. Morrill.	GEORGIA.	
AUGUSTA,	G. S. Carpenter & Co.	AUGUSTA,	W. J. Hobby.
BANGOR,	Smith & Fenn.	SAVANNAH,	Thomas Purse.
EASTPORT,	J. Beckford.	ALABAMA.	
RHODE ISLAND.		MOBILE,	Levi Fletcher.
PROVIDENCE,	B. Cranston & Co.	TENNESSEE.	
CONNECTICUT.		NASHVILLE,	W. A. Eichbaum.
NEW HAVEN,	Herrick & Noyes.	CHRISTIANVILLE,	B. S. Parsons.
HARTFORD,	Canfield & Robbins.	MISSISSIPPI.	
VERMONT.		NATCHEZ,	N. L. Williams.
BURLINGTON,	V. Harrington.	LOUISIANA.	
BRATTLEBORO',	Joseph Stearns.	NEW ORLEANS,	E. Johns & Co.
NEW JERSEY.			
TRENTON,	D. Fenton.		

The work will be sent by mail to any part of the United States on the remittance of one year's subscription (four dollars) to the Publishers, Boston, or to any of the agents, — subscribers paying postage, and taking the risk of conveyance.

The subscription becomes due on the publication of the second number; that is, on the 1st of May. Distant subscribers are expected to transmit the amount of their yearly subscriptions as soon as they receive the second number of each year.

CAMBRIDGE PRESS: — METCALF, TORRY, AND BALLOU.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
GENERAL REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES—No. XXX.

JULY, 1840.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
I. STRAUSS'S LIFE OF JESUS	273	CRITICAL NOTICES.	
Das Leben Jesu, Kritisch bearbeitet von Dr. DAVID FRIEDERICH STRAUSS		Two Articles from the Princeton Review, concerning the Transcendental Philosophy of the Germans, and of Cousin, and its influence on opinion in this Country	378
II. THE FOUNDATIONS OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE WANTS OF THE SOUL . . .	317	The Book of Jasher, referred to in Joshua and Second Samuel, faithfully translated from the original Hebrew into English	390
The Foundation of Christianity in the Wants of the Soul; a Discourse delivered before the University in Cambridge, by the Rev. W. B. O. PEABODY.		Critical and Miscellaneous Essays, by T. BABINGTON MAULAY	395
III. CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES IN ROME	325	The Scriptural Doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, in their relation to God the Father. By NATHANIEL S. FOLSOM	396
Local Vestiges of the Early Propagation of Christianity in the City of Rome.		NEW AND RECENT PUBLICATIONS	398
IV. THE LEGEND OF FRITHIOF	339	Mr. Gilman's Discourse.— Mr. Miles's Lecture on Natural Theology.— Levi Blodgett's Letter.— The Analyst.— Cabiro and Count Julian.— Fowle's Bible Reader.— The Chapel Hymn Book.	
Frithiof's Saga, or The Legend of Frithiof. By ESAIAS TEGNER.			
V. THE PERKINS INSTITUTION	359		
Eighth Annual Report of the Trustees of the Perkins Institution and Massachusetts Asylum for the Blind.			

BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY.

NEW YORK: C. S. FRANCIS.

LONDON: JOHN GREEN, 121 NEWGATE STREET.

1840.

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

The Christian Examiner is published once in two months, on the first day of March, May, July, September, November, and January, making six numbers of 136 pages each, or two volumes, of 408 pages each, for every year, at \$4 per annum, payable on the delivery of the second number; that is, on the first of May. All communications relating to subscriptions are to be addressed to "James Munroe & Co.," all others to the "Editor of the Christian Examiner," care of the same. Articles intended for insertion should be in the hands of the Editor two months before the day of publication of any given number.

No Subscription is received for less than a year.

THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY,
PUBLISHERS,

No. 134 Washington Street, Boston.

AGENTS.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

PORTSMOUTH, J. W. Foster.
EXETER, F. Grant.
DOVER, & } G. & E. Wadleigh.
GREAT FALLS, }
KEENE, George Tilden.
CONCORD, Marsh, Capen, & Lyon.

MASSACHUSETTS.

CAMBRIDGE, J. Owen.
CHARLESTOWN, G. W. Warren.
CONCORD, J. Stacy.
TAUNTON, S. O. Dunbar.
SALEM, } Caleb Foote.
 } H. Whipple.
NEWBURYPORT, Jno. Gray, Jr.
HINGHAM, Moses L. Whitton.
NEW BEDFORD, William Howe.
PLYMOUTH, W. S. Bartlett.
WORCESTER, C. Harris.
SPRINGFIELD, Samuel Bowles.
NORTHAMPTON, J. H. Butler.
LOWELL, Oliver March.
AMHERST, J. S. & C. Adams.

MAINE.

PORTLAND, Colman & Chisholm.
HALLOWELL, C. Spaulding.
BELFAST, James P. White.
AUGUSTA, G. S. Carpenter & Co.
BANGOR, Smith & Fenno.
EASTPORT, J. Beckford.

RHODE ISLAND.

PROVIDENCE, B. Cranston & Co.

CONNECTICUT.

NEW HAVEN, Herrick & Noyes.
HARTFORD, Canfield & Robbins.

VERMONT.

BURLINGTON, Rev. G. P. Ingersoll.
BRATTLEBORO', Joseph Steen.

NEW JERSEY.

TRENTON, D. Fenton.

NEW YORK.

ALBANY, W. C. Little.
NEW YORK, C. S. Francis.
TRENTON, Isaac B. Pierce.
CANANDAIGUA, L. Morse.
AUBURN, Ivison & Terry.
BUFFALO, O. G. Steele.
ROCHESTER, C. Morse.
SYRACUSE, G. J. Gardner.

PENNSYLVANIA.

PHILADELPHIA, Dr. J. Robertson.
PITTSBURG, Kay & Co.

MARYLAND.

BALTIMORE, N. Hickman.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

WASHINGTON, Kennedy & Elliott.

VIRGINIA.

RICHMOND, R. D. Sanxay.
NORFOLK, C. Hall.

KENTUCKY.

LEXINGTON, C. Wallace.

OHIO.

CINCINNATI, Josiah Drake.
MARIETTA, N. Ward.

NORTH CAROLINA.

RALEIGH, J. Gales & Son.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

CHARLESTON, Rev. S. Gilman.
COLUMBIA, B. D. Plant.

GEORGIA.

AUGUSTA, W. J. Hobby.
SAVANNAH, Thomas Purse.

ALABAMA.

MOBILE, Dr. H. Gates.

TENNESSEE.

NASHVILLE, W. A. Eichbaum.
CHRISTIANVILLE, B. S. Parsons.

MISSISSIPPI.

NATCHEZ, N. L. Williams.

LOUISIANA.

NEW ORLEANS, E. Johns & Co.

The work will be sent by mail to any part of the United States on the remittance of one year's subscription (four dollars) to the Publishers, Boston, or to any of the agents,—subscribers paying postage, and taking the risk of conveyance.

The subscription becomes due on the publication of the second number; that is, on the 1st of May. Distant-subscribers are expected to transmit the amount of their yearly subscriptions as soon as they receive the second number of each year.

CAMBRIDGE PRESS:—METCALF, TORRY, AND BALLOU.

